WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

LENIN

COLLECTED WORKS

41

THE RUSSIAN EDITION WAS PRINTED
IN ACCORDANCE WITH A DECISION
OF THE NINTH CONGRESS OF THE R.C.P.(B.)
AND THE SECOND CONGRESS OF SOVIETS
OF THE U.S.S.R.

ИНСТИТУТ МАРКСИЗМА—ЛЕНИНИЗМА при ЦК КНСС

В. И. ЛЕНИН

СОЧИНЕНИЯ

Издание четвертое

ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО
ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ
МОСКВА

V. I. LENIN

COLLECTED WORKS

VOLUME
41

1896 – October 1917

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN
BY YURI SDOBNIKOV

From Marx to Mao

© Digital Reprints
2014
www.marx2mao.com

First printing 1969
Second printing 1971
Third printing 1977

Л $\frac{10102—210}{014\ (01)—77}$ беэ объявл.

CONTENTS

Page

Preface 27

1896-1904

COMMUNICATION ON BEHALF OF THE "STARIKI" TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ST. PETERSBURG LEAGUE OF STRUGGLE FOR THE EMANCIPATION OF THE WORKING CLASS 33

FOR THE DRAFT AGREEMENT WITH STRUVE 34

SECRET DOCUMENT 35

REMARKS ON RYAZANOV'S ARTICLE "TWO TRUTHS" 36

MATERIAL FOR WORKING OUT THE R.S.D.L.P. PROGRAMME 38

1. OUTLINE OF VARIOUS POINTS OF THE PRACTICAL SECTION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME 38
2. OUTLINE OF PLEKHANOV'S FIRST DRAFT PROGRAMME WITH SOME AMENDMENTS 39
3. RECORD OF POINTS ONE AND TWO OF PLEKHANOV'S FIRST DRAFT PROGRAMME, AND OUTLINE OF POINT ONE OF THE PROGRAMME'S THEORETICAL SECTION. 42
4. INITIAL VARIANT OF THE THEORETICAL SECTION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME 43
5. OUTLINES OF PLAN OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME 47
6. INITIAL VARIANT OF THE AGRARIAN SECTION AND THE CONCLUDING SECTION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME 48
7. OUTLINES OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME 49
8. ADDENDA TO THE AGRARIAN AND FACTORY SECTIONS OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME 53

REPLIES TO PLEKHANOV'S AND AXELROD'S REMARKS ON THE ARTICLE "THE AGRARIAN PROGRAMME OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY" 53

INTRODUCTION TO THE LEAFLET OF THE DON COMMITTEE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. "TO THE CITIZENS OF RUSSIA" 69

INTRODUCTION TO THE LEAFLET "TO THE CITIZENS OF ALL RUSSIA" 70

PLAN FOR A PAMPHLET AGAINST THE S.R.s 70

THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. July 17 (30)-August 10 (23), 1903 78

1. PROGRAMME OF THE R.S.D.L.P. REGULAR SECOND CONGRESS 78
2. SPEECHES DURING THE EXAMINATION OF THE LIST OF QUESTIONS SUBJECT TO DEBATE AT THE CONGRESS. *July 17 (30)* 85
   1 85
   2 85
3. SPEECH ON THE ACTIONS OF THE ORGANISING COMMITTEE. *July 18 (31)* 85
4. SPEECH ON THE ATTENDANCE OF THE POLISH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS AT THE CONGRESS. *July 18 (31)* 86
5. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE GENERAL SECTION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME. *July 29 (August 11)* 86
6. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE GENERAL POLITICAL DEMANDS OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME *July 30 (August 12)* 86
   1 86
   2 87
   3 87
7. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE GENERAL POLITICAL DEMANDS OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME. *July 31 (August 13)* 87
8. PROPOSALS ON VARIOUS POINTS OF THE GENERAL POLITICAL DEMANDS OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME . 87
9. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE SECTION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME RELATING TO LABOUR PROTECTION. *July 31 (August 13)* 88
   1 88
   2 88
10. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE AGRARIAN PROGRAMME. *August 1 (14)* 88
    1 88
    2 89
    3 89
    4 89
    5 89
    6 90
    7 90

11. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE PARTY RULES. *August 2 (15)* 90
12. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE PARTY RULES. *August 4 (17)* 91
1 91
2 91
3 91
4 91
5 92
13. ADDENDUM TO PARAGRAPH 12 OF THE DRAFT PARTY RULES 92
14. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE PARTY RULES. *August 5 (18)* 92
1 92
2 93
3 93
4 93
15. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE STATEMENT BY MARTYNOV AND AKIMOV. *August 5 (18)* 93
16. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE STATEMENT BY MARTYNOV AND AKIMOV. *August 5 (18)* 94
1 94
2 94
17. ADDENDUM TO MARTOV'S RESOLUTION ON THE BUND'S WITHDRAWAL FROM THE R.S.D.L.P. . . . 95
18. SPEECH DURING THE ELECTION OF THE PARTY'S CENTRAL COMMITTEE. *August 7 (20)* 95
19. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION OF POTRESOV (STAROVER) ON THE ATTITUDE TO THE LIBERALS. *August 10 (23)* 96
THE LAW ON COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO WORKERS INJURED IN ACCIDENTS 96
TO THE MINUTES COMMITTEE OF THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. 103
TO THE MINUTES COMMITTEE OF THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. 104
THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE LEAGUE OF RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY ABROAD. October 13-18 (26-31), 1903 104
1. REMARKS ON THE AGENDA. *October 13 (26)* 104
1 104

FROM MARX TO MAO
NOT FOR COMMERCIAL DISTRIBUTION

2 105
3 105
2. PREFATORY REMARK TO THE REPORT ON THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. *October 13* (*26*) 105
3. STATEMENT CONCERNING MARTOV'S REPORT. *October 16* (*29*) 106
4. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE LEAGUE RULES. *October 17* (*30*) 106
1 106
2 106
5. SPEECH ON THE RESULT OF THE VOTING OF THE RESOLUTIONS ON THE LEAGUE RULES. *October 17* (*30*) 107
DECISION OF THE PARTY COUNCIL. *Geneva. November 1, 1903* 107
R.S.D.L.P. COUNCIL. January 15-17 (*28-30*), *1904* 108
1. REMARK ON A POINT OF ORDER. *January 15* (*28*) . . 108
2. REMARKS ON THE AGENDA. *January 16* (*29*) 108
1 108
2 108
3. SPEECH MOTIONING A DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE IN THE PARTY. *January 16* (*29*) 109
4. SPEECH CONCERNING THE MINORITY OPINION ENTERED BY THE C.C. REPRESENTATIVES. *January 17* (*30*) 109
5. SPEECH IN DEFENCE OF THE MINORITY OPINION OF THE C.C. REPRESENTATIVES. *January 17* (*30*) 110
6. REMARK ON THE AGENDA. *January 17* (*30*) 110
7. DRAFT RESOLUTION MOVED ON JANUARY 17 (30) . 110
ON BEHALF OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY 111
TO THE RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT 111
THREE OUTLINES FOR A REPORT ON THE PARIS COMMUNE 113
1 113
2 119
3 121
R.S.D.L.P. COUNCIL. May 31 and June 5 (*June 13 and 18*) *1904* 122

1. REMARK ON THE AGENDA. *May 31* (*June 13*) 122
2. SPEECHES ON AN INTER-PARTY CONFERENCE. *May 31* (*June 13*) 122
1 122
2 122
3. SPEECHES ON R.S.D.L.P. REPRESENTATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS. *May 31* (*June 13*) 123
1 123
2 123
3 123
4. REMARK ON THE NEED OF CONTROL OVER THE GNCHAK NEWSPAPER. *May 31* (*June 13*) 124
5. MOTION OF AMENDMENT TO MARTOV'S RESOLUTION ON THE RIGHT OF THE C.O. AND THE C.C. TO RECALL THEIR REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE PARTY COUNCIL. *June 5* (*18*) 124
6. SPEECH ON CO-OPTATION TO THE COMMITTEES AND ON THE C.C.'S RIGHT TO APPOINT NEW MEMBERS. *June 5* (*18*) 124
7. SPEECHES ON THE VOTING PROCEDURE IN DECIDING THE QUESTION OF CONVENING THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. *June 5* (*18*) 125
1 125
2 125
3 125
4 126
8. SPEECHES ON THE QUESTION OF PUBLISHING THE MINUTES OF THE PARTY COUNCIL SITTINGS. *June 5* (*18*) 126
1 126
2 127
3 127
STATEMENT ON THE TRANSFER OF THE POWERS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. C.C. REPRESENTATIVES ABROAD 127
DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE MAJORITY'S GENEVA GROUP 127
PLANS FOR AN ARTICLE "THE PEASANTRY AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY" 129
1 129
2 129
PLAN FOR A PROPAGANDA TALK ON CRISES 131

PLAN FOR THREE TALKS ON THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PROGRAMME 132
NOTE BY THE *VPERYOD* EDITORIAL BOARD TO THE LETTER OF THEIR ST. PETERSBURG CORRESPONDENT 133
OUTLINE OF THESES FOR AN ARTICLE "HOW THEY DEFEND THEMSELVES" 134
STATEMENT BY THE GROUP OF FOUNDERS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. LIBRARY AT GENEVA 136

1905-1910

PLAN FOR AN ARTICLE "1895 AND 1905 (SHORT PARALLEL)" 137
A MILITANT AGREEMENT FOR THE UPRISING AND THE FORMATION OF A COMBAT COMMITTEE 138
RECORD OF SPEECHES AT THE GENEVA BOLSHEVIK CLUB. *Minutes of March 6, 1905* 139
I. 139
II. 140
III. 141
NOTE BY THE *VPERYOD* EDITORIAL BOARD TO A RESOLUTION BY A GROUP OF WORKERS OF THE ST. PETERSBURG METALWORKS 141
THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. April 12-27 (*April 25-May 10*), *1905* 142
1. DRAFT RESOLUTIONS OF THE ORGANISING COMMITTEE FOR CONVENING THE THIRD CONGRESS ON THE REPRESENTATION OF CERTAIN ORGANISATIONS 142
2. O.C. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CONGRESS. 144
3. SPEECH ON THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE REPORT CONCERNING THE KAZAN COMMITTEE'S REPRESENTATION AT THE CONGRESS. *April 13* (*26*) 145
4. AMENDMENT TO A CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE PROPOSAL ON THE KAZAN COMMITTEE'S REPRESENTATION AT THE CONGRESS. *April 13* (*26*) 146
5. SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF A DEBATE ON THE O.C. REPORT. *April 13* (*26*) 146
6. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE DEBATE ON THE O.C. REPORT 147
7. DRAFT AGENDA OF THE THIRD PARTY CONGRESS 147
8. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE CONGRESS AGENDA. *April 13* (*26*) 148
9. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE CONGRESS STANDING ORDERS. *April 13* (*26*) 148

10. SPEECH MOTIONING A DRAFT RESOLUTION ON ELECTION OF COMMITTEES TO EXAMINE DELEGATES' REPORTS AND TO DRAFT RESOLUTIONS. *April 13* (*26*) 149
11. STATEMENTS TO THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS 150
1 150
2 150
12. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE'S REPORT. *April 14* (*27*) 151
13. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON CONFIRMATION OF THE KAZAN AND KUBAN COMMITTEES 151
14. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PROCEDURE GOVERNING VOTING AT THE CONGRESS 151
15. REMARKS ON RUMYANTSEV'S DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION OF OPEN POLITICAL ACTION BY THE R.S.D.L.P. 152
16. THESES FOR A RESOLUTION ON THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS' PARTICIPATION IN A PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT 153
17. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION OF OPEN POLITICAL ACTION BY THE R.S.D.L.P. *April 19* (*May 2*) 155
18. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE GOVERNMENT'S TACTICS ON THE EVE OF A REVOLUTION. *April 19* (*May 2*) 155
1 155
2 155
19. RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TO THE PEASANT MOVEMENT 156
20. TO THE PRESIDIUM OF THE CONGRESS 157
21. OUTLINE OF A SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN WORKERS AND INTELLECTUALS IN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC ORGANISATIONS . . 157
22. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE PARTY RULES. *April 21* (*May 4*) 158
1 158
2 158
3 158
4 158
5 159
6 159
7 159
8 159

23. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ON GENERAL MEETING OF THE C.C. *April 21* (*May 4*) 159
24. SPEECH ON THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE KAZAN COMMITTEE'S REPRESENTATION. *April 22* (*May 5*) 160
25. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN WORKERS AND INTELLECTUALS IN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC ORGANISATIONS. *April 22* (*May 5*) 160
26. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE ADDITIONAL RESOLUTION TO THE PARTY RULES ON PERIODIC CONFERENCES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF VARIOUS PARTY ORGANISATIONS. *April 22* (*May 5*) 161
1 161
2 161
27. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE SPLINTER SECTION OF THE PARTY 161
28. SPEECH ON RUMYANTSEV'S RESOLUTION ON THE SPLINTER SECTION OF THE PARTY. *April 23* (*May 6*) 162
29. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS NON-RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC ORGANISATIONS. *April 23* (*May 6*) . 162
30. SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF THE ATTITUDE TO THE LIBERALS. *April 23* (*May 6*) 163
31. SPEECH ON THE REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE C.C. *April 25* (*May 8*) 163
32. PROPOSAL ON PROCEDURE GOVERNING ELECTION TO THE C.C. *April 25* (*May 8*) 164
33. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE TIME OF THE C.C.'S ENTRY INTO OFFICE 164
34. SPEECH ON THE PUBLICATION OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. *April 25* (*May 8*) 164
35. AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PROPAGANDA AND AGITATION 165
36. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE EVENTS IN THE CAUCASUS. *April 26* (*May 9*) 165
1 165
2 166

PLAN FOR A REPORT ON THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. AND ITS DECISIONS 166

REMARKS ON THE ARTICLE "ON A PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT" 168
ESSAY ON THE PARTY SPLIT 168
THE LATEST NEWS REPORT 169
NOTE BY THE COMMITTEE FOR PUBLICATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE R.S.D.L.P. THIRD CONGRESS TO THE TEXT OF THE MINUTES 170
DRAFT LEAFLET 171
OUTLINE OF TACTICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BOLSHEVIKS AND MENSHEVIKS OVER THE ATTITUDE TO THE BULYGIN DUMA 172
REMARKS ON THE QUESTION OF ELECTIONS TO THE BULYGIN DUMA 173
PLAN FOR AN ARTICLE "THE PRINCIPAL TASK OF SOCIALIST POLICY" 174
NOTE 175
RUSSIA'S FINANCES 176
INSERTIONS FOR V. KALININ'S ARTICLE "THE PEASANT CONGRESS" 177
1 177
2 177
SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE POWERS OF REPRESENTATION OF THE DISTRICT AND THE VYBORG ORGANISATIONS AT THE ST. PETERSBURG CITY CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. *February 11* (*24*), *1906* . . 178
1 178
2 178
3 179
4 179
5 179
THE UNITY CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. April 10-25 (*April 23-May 8*), *1906* 179
1. SPEECHES AT THE SECOND SITTING OF THE CONGRESS CONCERNING THE ROLL-CALL VOTE ON THE WRITTEN STATEMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS BUREAU 179
1 179
2 180
2. SPEECH AT THE THIRD SITTING OF THE CONGRESS . 180

3. PROPOSAL ON FORMULATING POINT VIII OF THE DRAFT AGENDA FOR THE CONGRESS 180
4. WRITTEN STATEMENT AT THE 15TH SITTING OF THE CONGRESS 181
5. SPEECH AT THE 24TH SITTING OF THE CONGRESS . 181
AMONG THE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES 181
AMONG THE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES 182
AMONG THE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES 183
AMONG THE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES 185
THE SECOND CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (*FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE*), *November 3-7* (*16-20*), *1906* . . . 186
1. REPORT ON THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN FOR THE SECOND DUMA. *November 4* (*17*) 186
2. SUMMING-UP SPEECH ON THE REPORT ON THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN FOR THE SECOND DUMA. *November 4* (*17*) 187
3. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE MENSHEVIK ELECTORAL PLATFORM. *November 6* (*19*) 187
4. SPEECHES ON THE QUESTION OF CONVENING A "LABOUR CONGRESS". *November 7* (*20*) 188
1 188
2 188
5. MINORITY OPINION ENTERED AT THE ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. ON BEHALF OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC DELEGATES OF POLAND, THE LATVIAN TERRITORY, ST. PETERSBURG, MOSCOW, THE CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL REGION AND THE VOLGA AREA 188
LABOUR CONGRESS AND MERGER WITH THE S.R.s (*Note*) . 191
REPORT AT A CONFERENCE OF THE ST. PETERSBURG ORGANISATION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. ON ELECTORAL AGREEMENTS IN ELECTIONS FOR THE SECOND DUMA. *January 6* (*19*), *1907*. *Brief Newspaper Report* 193
ARE THE MENSHEVIKS ENTITLED TO CONDUCT A POLICY OF SUPPORTING THE CADETS? 194
REPLY TO L. MARTOV 196
THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. April 30-May 19 (*May 13-June 1*), *1907* 197
1. SPEECH AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO CLOSE THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE CONGRESS AGENDA. *May 1* (*14*) 197

2. SPEECH IN DEFENCE OF THE NAME-TICKET VOTE METHOD. *May 2* (*15*) 197
3. SPEECHES FROM THE CHAIR AT THE SIXTH SITTING OF THE CONGRESS. *May 3* (*16*) 198
1 198
2 198
4. OBJECTION TO LIEBER'S AMENDMENT TO THE BOLSHEVIK RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CONGRESS ON THE ATTITUDE TO BOURGEOIS PARTIES. *May 15* (*28*) 198
5. SPEECH ON DESIGNATING THE CONGRESS. *May 19* (*June 1*) 199
ON THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT AT THE CURRENT STAGE OF THE BOURGEOIS-DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION . . 199
NOTES TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE STUTTGART CONGRESS ON "MILITARISM AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS" . . . 200
NOTES TO CLARA ZETKIN'S ARTICLE "INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS IN STUTTGART" 201
ANTI-MILITARIST PROPAGANDA AND YOUNG SOCIALIST WORKERS' LEAGUES 204
HOW THE SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARIES WRITE HISTORY . . 207
THE THIRD DUMA AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY 209
PLENARY MEETING OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE. August 11-13 (*24-26*), *1908* 216
1. STATEMENT ON THE CONVOCATION OF THE C.C. PLENARY MEETING 216
2. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE INCIDENT OVER THE CONVOCATION OF THE C.C. PLENARY MEETING . . . 217
3. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ORGANISATION OF THE CENTRAL BUREAU ABROAD 217
THE FIFTH ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. December 21-27, 1908 (*January 3-9*, *1909*) 218
1. OUTLINE OF SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF ORGANISATION 218
2. EXPLANATION TO SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF ORGANISATION 219
3. PROPOSAL ON PROCEDURE FOR VOTING RESOLUTIONS 219
4. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PUBLICATION OF CONFERENCE DECISIONS 220

5. STATEMENT OF FACT 220
6. STATEMENT CONCERNING THE MENSHEVIK DRAFT ON LIQUIDATING THE C.C. 220
PLAN FOR LECTURES ON MARXISM 221
CONFERENCE OF THE ENLARGED EDITORIAL BOARD OF "PROLETARY". June 8-17 (21-30), 1909 222
1. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON AGITATION FOR A BOLSHEVIK CONGRESS OR A BOLSHEVIK CONFERENCE SEPARATE FROM THE PARTY. *June 8 (21)* 222
1 222
2 223
2. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF OTZOVISM AND ULTIMATUMISM. *June 9 (22)* 223
3. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE PARTY SCHOOL ON CAPRI. *June 10 (23)* 225
4. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE FACTION'S UNITY. *June 12 (25)* 226
5. FIRST SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF BOLSHEVIK TASKS RELATING TO DUMA ACTIVITY. *June 12 (25)* 227
6. ADDENDUM TO THE RESOLUTION "ON THE ATTITUDE TO DUMA ACTIVITY AMONG THE OTHER BRANCHES OF PARTY WORK" 228
7. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE PARTY PRESS. *June 15 (28)* 229
8. SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF PUBLISHING PHILOSOPHICAL ARTICLES IN THE CENTRAL ORGAN. *June 15 (28)* 229
9. PROPOSAL ON THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR A NEWSPAPER OF THE DUMA GROUP. *June 16 (29)* . 229
10. SPEECHES AND PROPOSALS IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF REORGANISING THE BOLSHEVIK CENTRE. *June 17 (30)* 230
1 230
2 230
3 230
4 230
PLAN FOR A LECTURE "THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS IN COPENHAGEN AND ITS IMPORTANCE" . . . 230

1911-1914

PLAN FOR A LECTURE IN A COURSE ON "FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY". *Lecture IV* 232

MEETING OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS. May 28-June 4 (June 10-17), 1911 233

1. REPORT ON THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN THE PARTY . 233
2. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CONSTITUTING THE MEETING. *May 28 (June 10)* . 237
   1 237
   2 237
   3 238
   4 238
3. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CONVENING A C.C PLENARY MEETING, *May 30 (June 12)* 239
   1 239
   2 239
   3 239
   4 240
4. PROPOSAL FOR RESOLUTION ON CONVENING A PARTY CONFERENCE 240
5. STATEMENT 240

STATEMENT 241

INSERTION FOR L. B. KAMENEV'S PAMPHLET *TWO PARTIES* 241

PLAN FOR A LECTURE "MANIFESTO OF THE LIBERAL LABOUR PARTY" 242

PROPOSAL ON RULES FOR THE ORGANISATION ABROAD MOTIONED AT A MEETING OF BOLSHEVIK GROUPS ABROAD 243

OUTLINE OF A REPORT ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION . 243

THE SIXTH (PRAGUE) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. January 5-17 (18-30), 1912 245

1. TO THE DRAFT RESOLUTION "ON THE RUSSIAN ORGANISING COMMISSION FOR CONVENING THE CONFERENCE" 245
2. OUTLINE OF SPEECH ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CONFERENCE 246
3. REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU. *January 7 (20), 1912* 247
4. SPEECH ON THE ADOPTION OF THE RESOLUTION ON COMBATING THE FAMINE. *January 8 (21), 1912* . . . 249

5. DRAFT CHANGES IN THE PARTY'S ORGANISATIONAL RULES 249
6. SPEECH ON THE ORGANISATIONAL QUESTION. *January 11* (*24*), *1912* 250
7. TO THE DRAFT RESOLUTION "ON THE CHARACTER AND ORGANISATIONAL FORMS OF PARTY WORK" 252
8. MATERIAL FOR THE RESOLUTION ON THE "PETITION CAMPAIGN" 252

PLAN FOR A LECTURE "REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE OF THE RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT" 254

ROSA LUXEMBURG AND THE POLISH "PARTEI" VORSTAND IN MARTOV'S WAKE 255

REPLY TO LIQUIDATORS' ARTICLE IN *LEIPZIGER VOLKSZEITUNG* 260

TO ALL THE CITIZENS OF RUSSIA 262

ON POLITICAL SPINELESSNESS (*Letter to the Editor*) . . . 266

REPORT TO THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU, "ELECTIONS TO THE FOURTH DUMA" 267

MORE ABOUT THE PEASANT DEPUTIES IN THE FOURTH DUMA 271

RESOLUTION OF THE CRACOW MEETING OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE WITH PARTY FUNCTIONARIES ON THE REORGANISATION AND WORK OF THE PRAVDA EDITORIAL BOARD 272

LETTER TO THE EXECUTIVE OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY 274

PRAVDA'S ANNIVERSARY (*Workers' Support for the Working Class Newspaper*) 278

THE STRUGGLE OF PARTIES IN CHINA 281

CONCERNING THE EDITORIAL IN THE NEWSPAPER *LUCH* No. 189 283

LANDOWNERS ON THE MIGRATION OF AGRICULTURAL LABOUR 285

WORKING-CLASS PARTY AND LIBERAL RIDERS (*On Potresov*) 287

CAPITALISTS AND ARMAMENTS 288

CHEAP MEAT FOR THE "PEOPLE" 289

DRAFT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE R.S.D.L.P. C.C. AND THE PRIBOI GROUP ON ITS RECOGNITION AS THE R.S.D.L.P. C.C. PUBLISHERS 291

THE OCTOBRISTS AND THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT 292

ON THE "JUBILEE OF THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA" . 294
DRAFT RESOLUTION BY WORKERS' ORGANISATIONS ON THE SLANDEROUS LIQUIDATORS' CHARGE AGAINST INSURANCE WORKER X 296
RUSSIAN WORKERS' ASSESSMENT OF THE SPLIT IN THE DUMA SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC GROUP 296
OUTLINE OF A REPORT TO LOCAL ORGANISATIONS ON THE PORONIN JOINT CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. C.C. AND PARTY FUNCTIONARIES (1913) 297
ON THE QUESTION OF THE BUREAU'S NEXT STEPS . . . 299
THE POVERTY OF THE PEOPLE'S TEACHERS 300
RUSSIAN WORKERS AND THE INTERNATIONAL 302
HOW THE LIQUIDATORS ARE CHEATING THE WORKERS . 305
RESOLUTION ON THE SOCIALIST BUREAU'S DECISION . . . 308
ABOUT OUR SCHOOLS 310
THE DUMA GROUP AND THE MAJORITY OUTSIDE 311
THESES FOR A LECTURE ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION . 313
INSERTION FOR N. K. KRUPSKAYA'S ARTICLE "ON THE QUESTION OF THE POLICY OF THE MINISTRY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION" 323
THE FOURTH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS OF THE LATVIAN TERRITORY. January 13-26 (January 26-February 8), 1914 324
1. REPORT OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE AT THE FOURTH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS OF THE LATVIAN TERRITORY 324
2. SUMMING-UP SPEECH AT THE FOURTH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS OF THE LATVIAN TERRITORY 327
3. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS OF THE LATVIAN TERRITORY TO THE R.S.D.L.P. 329
RESOLUTION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON SETTING UP AN ORGANISATIONAL SECTION OF THE C.C. TO DIRECT ILLEGAL WORK 330
REVIEW. I. M. Kozminykh-Lanin. *Overtime at Factories and Plants in Moscow Gubernia* 331
DECISION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE . . . 334
POLISH OPPOSITION AT THE BRUSSELS CONFERENCE . . . 334
PLANS FOR AN ARTICLE "REVOLUTION AND WAR" . . . 335
1 335
2 335

1914-1917

ON THE SLOGAN TO TRANSFORM THE IMPERIALIST WAR INTO A CIVIL WAR 337

PLAN FOR A PAMPHLET *THE EUROPEAN WAR AND EUROPEAN SOCIALISM* 337

TO THE AUTHOR OF *THE SONG OF THE FALCON* 344

EDITORIAL NOTE TO THE ARTICLE "THE UKRAINE AND THE WAR" 345

DRAFT POINT THREE OF THE RESOLUTION "THE C.O. AND THE NEW PAPER", ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. SECTIONS ABROAD 346

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST WOMEN'S CONFERENCE 346

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE AT ZIMMERWALD. August 25-26 (*September 5-8*), *1915* . . . 349

1. VARIANT OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION OF LEFT-WING SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS FOR THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE 349
2. THESES FOR A REPORT AT A MEETING OF LEFT-WING SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS 351
3. PLAN FOR A SPEECH AT THE ZIMMERWALD CONFERENCE 352
4. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE MANIFESTO AND THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE WAR AND THE TASKS OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY. *August 26* (*September 7*) 353

   1 353

   2 354
5. ADDENDA TO THE STATEMENT BY THE ZIMMERWALD LEFT 355

GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION 355

AMENDMENTS AND ADDENDA TO THE APPEAL "TO ALL AFFILIATED PARTIES AND GROUPS", ADOPTED BY A CONFERENCE OF THE ENLARGED INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST COMMISSION 356

PLAN FOR A LECTURE ON "TWO INTERNATIONALS" . . . 358-59

NOTE TO THE THESES "SOCIALIST REVOLUTION AND THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION" . . . 366

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE TO TERMINATE PUBLICATION OF THE JOURNAL *KOMMUNIST* 367

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE AT KIENTHAL. April 11-17 (24-30), 1916 369

1. INITIAL VARIANT OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE PROPOSAL 369

2. SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON CONVENING THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU *April 15, (28)* 379

1 379

2 380

3 380

ON THE DECLARATION BY THE POLISH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS AT THE ZIMMERWALD CONFERENCE 380

PLAN FOR AN ARTICLE "ON THE QUESTION OF THE ROLE OF THE STATE" 381

THESES ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE SWISS SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO THE WAR 382

REMARKS ON AN ARTICLE ABOUT MAXIMALISM 384

PLANS FOR A PAMPHLET *STATISTICS AND SOCIOLOGY* . 387

1 387

2 389

3 390

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CENTRE AS A TREND IN INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY 391

PLAN FOR AN ARTICLE "THE LESSONS OF THE WAR" . . 393

OUTLINE OF FIFTH "LETTER FROM AFAR" 394

REPLIES TO A CORRESPONDENT OF THE NEWSPAPER *POLITIKEN*. MARCH 31 (APRIL 13), 1917 396

REPLY TO F. STRÖM, A SPOKESMAN OF THE LEFT-WING SWEDISH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS. MARCH 31 (APRIL 13), 1917 396

RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARIES' TRIP ACROSS GERMANY. *Commiuniqué of the Group* 397

SPEECH AT A CONFERENCE WITH LEFT-WING SWEDISH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS. MARCH 31 (APRIL 13), 1917. *Newspaper Report* 398

SPEECH IN THE FINLAND STATION SQUARE TO WORKERS, SOLDIERS AND SAILORS. APRIL 3 (16), 1917. *Newspaper Report* 399

"LIBERTY LOAN" (*Draft Resolution Worked Out by the Bolshevik Group of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies*) 399

PETROGRAD CITY R.S.D.L.P.(B.) CONFERENCE. April 14-22 (April 27-May 5), 1917 400

1. REPORT ON THE PRESENT SITUATION AND THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT. APRIL 14 (27). *Newspaper Report* 400

2. SPEECH IN MOVING A RESOLUTION ON THE WAR. *April 22* (*May 5*) 402

SPEECH AT A MEETING OF SOLDIERS OF AN ARMOURED BATTALION IN MIKHAILOVSKY MANÈGE. APRIL 15 (28), 1917. *Newspaper Report* 402

MEETING OF THE SOLDIERS' SECTION OF THE PETROGRAD SOVIET OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES. April 17 (*30*), *1917* 404

1. SPEECH ON THE RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMISSION OF THE SOVIET OF SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES 404

2. REPLIES TO QUESTIONS 406

THE ATTENTION OF COMRADES! 407

POGROM AGITATION IN MINISTERIAL NEWSPAPER 407

THE SEVENTH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.). April 24-29 (*May 7-12*), *1917* 409

1. SPEECH ON THE PLAN TO CONVENE AN INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE. *April 25* (*May 8*) . 409

1. Variant of Minutes 409

2. Newspaper Report 411

2. PROPOSAL FOR LINES OF DEBATE ON V. P. NOGIN'S REPORT ON "ATTITUDE TO THE SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES". *April 25* (*May 8*) . . 412

3. SPEECH ON THE ATTITUDE TO THE SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES. *April 25* (*May 8*) . 413

1. Minutes 413

2. Newspaper Report 416

4. SPEECH IN DEFENCE OF THE RESOLUTION ON THE WAR. APRIL 27 (MAY 10). *Newspaper Report* . . . 417

5. REMARKS IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE WAR. *April 27* (*May 10*) 417

1 417

2 417

3 418

6. PRELIMINARY DRAFT ALTERATIONS IN THE R.S.D.L.P. PARTY PROGRAMME 418

FOR THE PROGRAMME. *Better Variant* 423

7. REPORT ON THE QUESTION OF REVISING THE PARTY PROGRAMME. APRIL 28 (MAY 11). *Newspaper Report* . 424
8. REPORT ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION. APRIL 28 (MAY 11). *Newspaper Report* 424
9. REMARK IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION. APRIL 28 (MAY 11) . . 426
10. SPEECH ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION. APRIL 29 (MAY 12). *Newspaper Report* 426
11. SPEECH ON THE SITUATION WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL AND THE TASKS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.). APRIL 29 (MAY 12). *Newspaper Report* 427
12. REMARKS IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE CURRENT SITUATION. *April 29* (*May 12*) . . . 428
1 428
2 428
OUTLINE OF UNIDENTIFIED SPEECH AT A MEETING . . . 429
TOO GROSS A LIE 429
AN UNFINISHED AUTOBIOGRAPHY 430
REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE SEVENTH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.) AT A MEETING OF THE PETROGRAD ORGANISATION. *May 8* (*21*), *1917* 431
PLAN OF RESOLUTION ON ECONOMIC MEASURES FOR COMBATING THE DISLOCATION 434
INSERTION FOR N. K. KRUPSKAYA'S ARTICLE "A PAGE FROM THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY" 435
STATEMENT OF FACT CONCERNING THE COMMISSION OF THE NEWSPAPER *VPERYOD* AT A MEETING OF THE ST. PETERSBURG R.S.D.L.P.(B.) COMMITTEE. *May 30* (*June 12*), *1917* 435
SPEECH AT A SITTING OF THE BOLSHEVIK GROUP OF THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES. MAY 31 (JUNE 13), 1917. *Brief Newspaper Report* 436
DRAFT RESOLUTION FOR A CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF DISTRICT COMMITTEES AND ARMY UNITS OF PETROGRAD TOGETHER WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE C.C. AND THE P.C. *June 10* (*23*), *1917* 437
ON THE GRIMM AFFAIR 438
SHAME! 439

REPORT ON THE CURRENT SITUATION AT THE ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF FRONT AND REAR MILITARY ORGANISATIONS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.). JUNE 20 (JULY 3), 1917. *Brief Newspaper Report* 439

THE POLITICAL SITUATION (*Four Theses*) 440

LETTER OVER THE PUBLICATION OF "LEAFLET ON THE CAPTURE OF RIGA" 443

FROM THE THESES FOR A REPORT AT THE OCTOBER 8 CONFERENCE OF THE ST. PETERSBURG ORGANISATION, AND ALSO FOR A RESOLUTION AND INSTRUCTIONS TO THOSE ELECTED TO THE PARTY CONGRESS 446

On the List of Candidates for the Constituent Assembly 446

Note to Theses "On the List of Candidates for the Constituent Assembly" 447

"THE LANDOWNERS HAVE HIT IT OFF WITH THE CADETS" 448

LETTER TO Y. M. SVERDLOV 450

Notes 453

Name Index 601

PREFACE

The additional volumes 41 to 45 of the present edition contain the most important of the new material included in the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works* of V. I. Lenin.

Volume 41 contains works written before the Great October Socialist Revolution, from 1896 to October 1917, which are an essential supplement to the works published in the respective volumes of the present edition.

A great part of the volume consists of documents reflecting Lenin's efforts in creating and strengthening the Bolshevik Party and working out the ideological and organisational principles, the programme and the rules of a new type of proletarian party. Among them are: "Outline of Various Points of the Practical Section of the Draft Programme", "Record of Points One and Two of Plekhanov's First Draft Programme, and Outline of Point One of the Programme's Theoretical Section", "Initial Variant of the Agrarian Section and the Concluding Section of the Draft Programme", and Lenin's speeches at the Second Party Congress. They show that Lenin helped the *Iskra* Editorial Board to draft a truly revolutionary programme.

The record of the Second Congress of the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad, the January and June (1904) sessions of the R.S.D.L.P. Council, "Draft Resolution of the Majority's Geneva Group", "Reply to L. Martov", "Report on the State of Affairs in the Party", and others show Lenin's struggle against the Mensheviks' splitting and disorganising activity after the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.

A large group of documents written by Lenin in connection with the work of the Third, Fourth and Fifth Congresses of the R.S.D.L.P. is of great importance for a study of the Party's strategy and tactics during the first Russian revolution. These documents contain propositions on the hegemony

of the proletariat, the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.

Considerable interest attaches to the works connected with the elaboration of Bolshevik tactics in the Duma (Parliament): the report and summing-up speech on the report on the election campaign for the Second Duma and other material of the Second Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (the First All-Russia Conference), the articles "Are the Mensheviks Entitled To Conduct a Policy of Supporting the Cadets?", "The Third Duma and Social-Democracy", "Report to the International Socialist Bureau, 'Elections to the Fourth Duma'", "The Duma Group and the Majority Outside", etc.

A number of works dating from the period of reaction reflect Lenin's struggle against ideological vacillations and deviations from Marxism. Lenin waged an implacable struggle against the avowed opportunists, the Menshevik liquidators, and also against the "Left" opportunists inside the Bolshevik Party—the otzovists, the ultimatumists and the *Vperyod* splinter group. In addition to the material already published, the volume contains 14 works by Lenin shedding light on the conference of *Proletary*'s enlarged Editorial Board which condemned both liquidationism and otzovism.

The volume gives a fuller picture of the meeting held by members of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee in Paris in June 1911. In his "Report on the State of Affairs in the Party" and speeches at the meeting, Lenin defined the Party's tasks in the struggle against the anti-Party groups.

The Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. brought to a close a long period of struggle against Menshevism. By expelling the Menshevik liquidators from the Party, it strengthened the Party as an all-Russia organisation, capable of giving a lead to the masses in a fresh revolutionary upsurge. The volume contains a number of documents which are of great interest for the study of the Conference. Among them are: "Report on the Work of the International Socialist Bureau", setting out important propositions on the new epoch, an epoch of socialist revolutions and "battles against the bourgeoisie", and on the

consequent sharpening of the struggle between the revolutionary Social-Democrats and the reformists inside the European socialist parties, and "Speech on the Organisational Question", emphasising the need to strengthen the Party's ties with the masses and to combine legal and illegal work.

The volume contains Lenin's resolution for the Cracow meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee with Party workers, "On the Reorganisation and Work of the *Pravda* Editorial Board". This decision shows how the Central Committee, led by Lenin, gave effective and concrete guidance to *Pravda*, the Party's most important legal organ.

In some of his works—"Reply to Liquidators' Article in *Leipziger Volkszeitung*", "Letter to the Executive of the German Social-Democratic Party", "On the Question of the Bureau's Next Steps", "Russian Workers and the International", "How the Liquidators Are Cheating the Workers", "Resolution on the Socialist Bureau's Decision"—Lenin gives a firm rebuff to attempts by the leaders of the German Social-Democrats and the Second International to "reconcile" and unite the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks by liquidating the Bolshevik Party.

Lenin's struggle for Party unity is characterised by the documents relating to the Fourth Congress of the Social-Democrats of the Latvian territory: his report and summing-up speech, and the draft resolution on the attitude of the Social-Democrats of the Latvian territory to the R.S.D.L.P.

Of the documents supplementing Lenin's elaboration of the national question, the volume includes: "Theses for a Lecture on the National Question", "German Social-Democracy and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination", "Note to the Theses 'Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination'", "On the Declaration by the Polish Social-Democrats at the Zimmerwald Conference", plans of an unfinished pamphlet, *Statistics and Sociology*, and "Speech on the National Question" at the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.).

Lenin urged the need for the workers to struggle against the danger of the world war which was being prepared by the imperialists of all countries, and exposed the opportunists who denied that such a struggle was of any real importance,

an attitude which doomed the workers to a passive stand. He believed that it was a major task of the revolutionary Social-Democrats to conduct anti-militarist propaganda and spread the idea of international solidarity among the working people. This question is dealt with in the following articles: "Notes to the Resolution of the Stuttgart Congress on 'Militarism and International Conflicts'", "Notes to Clara Zetkin's Article 'International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart'", "Anti-Militarist Propaganda and Young Socialist Workers' Leagues" and "How the Socialist-Revolutionaries Write History".

A number of documents published in the volume relate . to the period of the First World War, namely, "On the Slogan to Transform the Imperialist War into a Civil War", "Editorial Note to the Article 'The Ukraine and the War'", "Draft Point Three of the Resolution 'The C.O. and the New Paper', Adopted by the Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. Sections Abroad", "Draft Resolution of the International Socialist Women's Conference", "Variant of the Draft Resolution of Left-wing Social-Democrats for the First International Socialist Conference", "Plan for a Lecture on 'Two Internationals'", speeches at the Zimmerwald and Kienthal International Socialist conferences, "Draft Resolution of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee To Terminate Publication of the Journal *Kommunist*", "Remarks on an Article about Maximalism" and others. These documents show the Bolshevik tactics with regard to war, peace and revolution; they explain the slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war, and characterise Lenin's activity in rallying the Left-wing and revolutionary elements within the international working-class movement round the banner of internationalism, his struggle against social-chauvinism and Kautskyism (Centrism), and against the Left-wing opportunist, sectarian stand and splitting activities of the Bukharin-Pyatakov group.

A number of documents written after the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia in February 1917 contain Lenin's propositions concerning the Party's attitude to the bourgeois Provisional Government.

The volume contains material connected with Lenin's return from Switzerland to Russia in April 1917. It will be

recalled that the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois press started a campaign of slander and harassment over Lenin and the Bolsheviks' return home across Germany. This is fully exposed in the following: replies to a correspondent of the newspaper *Politiken* and to F. Ström, a spokesman of the Left-wing Swedish Social-Democrats, the group's communique, "Russian Revolutionaries' Trip Across Germany", speeches at a conference with Left-wing Swedish Social-Democrats on March 31 (April 13), at a meeting of the soldiers of an armoured battalion on April 15 (28), and at a meeting of the soldiers' section of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies on April 17 (30), "An Unfinished Autobiography", etc.

There is also a newspaper report of Lenin's speech upon his arrival in Petrograd on April 3 (16), 1917, when he addressed workers, soldiers and sailors in the Finland Station Square from the top of an armoured car.

Lenin's return, his elaboration of a concrete plan for going over from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to a socialist revolution, and the open exposition of his plan in the press and in speeches at numerous meetings helped to orient the Party towards preparations for a socialist revolution. A tremendous part in this effort was played by the Petrograd City and the Seventh All-Russia Party conferences held in April 1917. Some of Lenin's reports and speeches at these conferences are published both according to the minutes and the newspaper reports, which gives a fuller idea of their content. The volume also contains "Report on the Results of the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) at a Meeting of the Petrograd Organisation" on May 8 (21), 1917.

A number of documents in the volume deal with the drafting of the Party's second programme, which charted the building of a socialist economy in Russia. Among them are: "Outline of Fifth 'Letter from Afar'", "Preliminary Draft Alterations in the R.S.D.L.P. Party Programme", which was the basis for "Proposed Amendments to the Doctrinal, Political and Other Sections of the Programme" (see Vol. 24, pp. 459-63), "Report on the Question of Revising the Party Programme" at the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), etc.

The Party's policy on the basic aspects of the revolution, such as war, peace and the agrarian question, is explained in the "Speech at a Sitting of the Bolshevik Group of the First All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies", "Report on the Current Situation at the All-Russia Conference of Front and Rear Military Organisations of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)", the articles "The Attention of Comrades!", "Too Gross a Lie", "On the Grimm Affair", "Shame!" and others.

The theses "The Political Situation", which Lenin wrote after the July events, were published as an article in the newspaper *Proletarskoye Dyelo*, and that was how they appeared in Volume 25. Here they are given in their original form. They defined the Party's new tasks and tactics in the changed political situation. Great interest attaches to the "Letter Over the Publication of 'Leaflet on the Capture of Riga'", which was published for the first time in the Fifth Russian edition. Lenin gives important instructions in the item "On the List of Candidates for the Constituent Assembly" from his "Theses for a Report at the October 8 Conference of the St. Petersburg Organisation, and also for a Resolution and Instructions to Those Elected to the Party Congress", part of which was published in Volume 26. In a letter to Y. M. Sverdlov, Lenin exposes Kamenev and Zinoviev's strike-breaking behaviour and voices his confidence in the victory of the revolution.

A considerable part of the documents consists of preparatory material, such as plans, notes, outlines and theses, which show Lenin's methods and thoroughness in preparing his works. The plans of unfinished or unwritten articles, and plans for speeches and lectures which either have not been recorded, or of which a record no longer exists, are of great importance, because some of them contain vital theoretical propositions and characterise the Party's tasks.

This volume contains 47 of Lenin's works which were first published in the Fifth Russian edition.

Institute of Marxism-Leninism
of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee

1896 – 1904

COMMUNICATION ON BEHALF OF THE "STARIKI" TO THE MEMBERS OF THE ST. PETERSBURG LEAGUE OF STRUGGLE FOR THE EMANCIPATION OF THE WORKING CLASS[1]

Mikhailov first put in an appearance at St. Petersburg in 1891 as a Kharkov student expelled for making trouble. He entered a student organisation which bore the name of "corporation"[2] even after it fell apart. There was a rumour at the dental courses about his behaviour during a suspicious acquaintanceship; he was accused of spending money collected for the famine-stricken, but he made good the loss. At that time, he became intimate with....*

In January 1894, a search was also carried out in the homes of many former members of the said "corporation", including Mikhailov himself. At the interrogations, all heard a detailed reading on the membership of the society, etc. The gendarmes declared that the case arose on the strength of information supplied by a former member. Mikhailov was cleared of all suspicion by the gendarmes saying that importance had been attached to this trivial case only because an obvious revolutionary was involved in it. At the same time, a strike took place at the Voronin factory.[3] Mikhailov insinuated himself among them and started to make collections for their benefit. In February, eight workers who had dealt with Mikhailov and one student who had collected money on his assignment (Talalayev) were arrested. After that Mikhailov again started to edge closer to the ouvriers** and managed to penetrate into circles

---

* MS. illegible.—*Ed.*
** Workers.—*Ed.*

led by Narodovoltsi.[4] The latter were arrested in the summer of 1894. The inquiry revealed that the police had been informed of a great deal. At the inquiry involving our Stariki there was the charge that they were acquainted with some of these Narodovoltsi, but it happened....* The first Mikhailov case came to an end soon after* and others were exiled, but he was let off and told everyone that he had petitioned for clemency and that he had done so with the intention of continuing to work on the old lines. Unfortunately, some people failed to regard this fact as being sufficiently disgraceful and gave him their patronage, so that he who did not command any personal respect among the workers was given an opportunity to consolidate and extend his ties.

There follows a description of his methods, his pressing of money on workers, his invitations to them to visit him at home, the revelation of Party names, etc. In this way and because he enjoyed the full confidence of the said persons, he soon discovered the identity of many members of various groups. They were all arrested. When a worker ...* said that he had received books from Mikhailov, the latter was detained, but at once released and is still in St. Petersburg. As one of the accused at the inquiry, he informed on all his comrades; some of the accused ...* were read his detailed report on the membership of various groups. (Signatures.)

Written in 1896

First published in 1958 in Vol. 2 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

FOR THE DRAFT AGREEMENT WITH STRUVE[5]

Representatives of the *Zarya-Iskra* Social-Democratic group and the *Svoboda* democratic opposition group have agreed on the following:

1) The *Zarya* group shall publish with the magazine of the same name a special supplement entitled *Sovremennoye Obozreniye* in the editing of which the *Svoboda* group will take part.

* MS. illegible.—*Ed.*

2) The editing shall be conducted on the following basis: each of the sides has the right of veto in respect of material and articles.

3) Programme of the publication: a) material and documents relating to the activity of the government,* government, public and class institutions, etc.;

b) articles on questions of domestic public life in Russia and the government's domestic and foreign policy;

c) domestic reviews.

4) Both sides undertake to make efforts to supply material for *Sovremennoye Obozreniye*. But the *Zarya*[6] Editorial Board is free to carry in its special editions the material at its disposal on the subjects specified in § 3, whenever it is more suitable in character for such editions.

5) The *Zarya* group undertakes to perform all the necessary operations in publishing, transporting and distributing *Sovremennoye Obozreniye*. For its part, the X group shall pay all the expenses this entails.

6) In the event the said enterprise is liquidated, each side shall receive one-half of the copies of *Sovremennoye Obozreniye* in stock.

Note: The *Zarya* Editorial Board shall have the right to print announcements of its publications on the covers of *Sovrernennoye Obozreniye*.

Written before January 17 (30), 1901

First published in 1959 in Vol. 4 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

SECRET DOCUMENT

We draw readers' attention to Witte's minute published by *Zarya*,[7] which appeared in the hands of Dietz in Stuttgart. The minute, aimed against the draft of the former Minister for the Interior Goremykin on the

* The text given in brevier is in Potresov's hand.—*Ed*.

introduction of Zemstvos in non-Zemstvo gubernias,[8] is interesting as a document giving a brazen exposé of our rulers' most secret yearnings. We hope to deal in detail with this remarkable document and with Mr. R. N. S.'s introduction to it in the next issue of our newspaper.[9] This introduction, while showing that its author is aware of the political importance of the Russian working-class movement, is in all other respects marked with the usual immaturity of political thinking so characteristic of our liberals.

Iskra No. 5, June 1901

Printed from the *Iskra* text

REMARKS ON RYAZANOV'S ARTICLE "TWO TRUTHS"[10]

Pp.

1. The author regards as being of primary importance what Marx said (about the two ways) in *exceptional* circumstances and in virtually conditional terms.[11] However, the author distorts the fact, creating the impression that it was Marx himself who actually *raised* the question of the two ways.
7. "Laughter" at the men of the 70s (facing history) shows *not* "only an absolute incapacity for taking the historical standpoint", it is also evidence of theoretical *disparagement* of the men of the 70s, as compared with those of the 40s and 60s.
7a. The author touches up Mikhailovsky by emphasising that the latter had opposed V. V., but failing to say that he had gone along with V. V. very much more frequently and at greater length.
8. This is a glaring untruth: blaming Mikhailovsky for the *tragic* demise of the *Narodnaya Volya* and the "going among the people". The article is devoted to Mikhailovsky, whose Untergang* is purely *persönlicher*,** and whose fate contains a kopek's worth of the "tragic" and a ruble's worth of the comic.

---

* Downfall.—*Ed.*
** Personal.—*Ed.*

9. It is *stupid* to confuse the *dressing-down* of Mikhailovsky with the "shovelling of dirt on the generation of the revolutionary socialists of the 70s".
9. NB "refuses" to follow the reflection of the revolutionary majority in legal writings.
9-10. All the "Gekreuzigte und Verbannte"* ??
(of the 70s) ?
lend an avid ear to the voice of the ignoramus.
13. "Social questions give way to personal ones" (*and down to the end of the page* NB). |??|
(A downright Pisarev approach.)
15. ...(Pisarev) "A buoyant sermon of personal happiness"
" " " of "individualistic |??|
ideals".
18. " " "immersed in matters of personal self-improvement".
24-25. (§ III) A characteristic of the utopian socialism of the *revolutionaries* (of the 70s), which is confused with the Mikhailovsky trend.
28-29. Mikhailovsky frequently "sacrificed" one of the truths. *But* we are not interested in the "latest phase" of his activity. We are concerned with Mikhailovsky only as one who has given expression to a definite trend among the *young people* of the 70s and 80s.
31. What are the "limits" set "by nature to the mind"? (Theory of cognition.)
29-35. Exposition of the "system of truth".
35. ...This system "is an effort to discover the social element in reality..." which "would be concerned in realising the ideal".
41. From the dispute with Yuzov and Co. (a dry rehash), a leap over to Yakovenko (1886).
46-48. Pendant**=*Tkachov*.
Further *Axelrod*
and transition to Social-Democrats.
The whole exposition is dull and has little bearing on the "two foregoing" and on *Mikhailovsky*.

---

* "The crucified and the exiled".—*Ed.*
** Counterpart.—*Ed.*

And N. —on (52)!!—with Mikhailovsky's conclusions from his work (53).
§V, from p. 57 to p. 77 (78-80 about the "critics")—the birth of Marxism. It's all deadly dull; only on p. 82 does he return to the "*o l d t r u t h*".
—85— We reject the division of the world into noumena and phenomena.[12]

Written in September-October 1901

First published in 1959 in Vol. 5 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

MATERIAL FOR WORKING OUT THE R.S.D.L.P. PROGRAMME[13]

1

OUTLINE OF VARIOUS POINTS OF THE PRACTICAL SECTION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME

13.1.02

Finished

§11. Supervision by the organs of local self-government with the participation of workers' delegates over the sanitary state of the living quarters provided for workers by their employers, over the internal regulations on these premises and the terms of their lease, to safeguard wage-workers against intervention by employers in their life and activity as private persons and citizens.

§12. Correctly organised all-round sanitary supervision of working conditions at all enterprises employing wage labour.

13. Extension of supervision by factory inspectors to all the trades, handicrafts and cottage

industries, and also to government enterprises and agricultural enterprises employing wage labour.

14.
etc.

Agrarian. With the aim of eliminating all the remnants of our old serf-owning system, the Social-Democratic Labour Party demands:

1) cancellation of redemption payments
2) freedom of withdrawal from commune
3) reduction of rents through the courts
4) cut-off lands.[14]

{ Axelrod and Berg: "*facilitating* the struggle by the *peasant mass* against capitalist relations (or certain capitalist tendencies)". }

First published in 1959 in Vol. 6 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

2

OUTLINE OF PLEKHANOV'S FIRST DRAFT PROGRAMME WITH SOME AMENDMENTS

Paragraphs:

I. Domination of capitalist relations: the means of production in the hands of the capitalists, and the propertyless proletarians = wage-workers—2.*

II. Expansion of the sphere of domination of capital: growing economic importance of the big and decline of the small enterprises—1.

III. Capitalist relations weigh more and more heavily on the working class: occasioning a relative reduction in demand simultaneously with an increase in supply—4.

IV. Reduction in the price of labour-power. Growing social inequality—3.

* The figures in the MS. are in blue pencil and apparently indicate a desirable rearrangement of the test.—*Ed.*

+ consequently (capitalism causes??) the growth of social inequality, the growing gulf between the propertied and the propertyless (? + ?)

V. Crises—5.

VI. Growing discontent of the working class, sharpening struggle + growing realisation of the need for *social revolution*, *i.e.*

(explanation of it)—6.

VII. Social revolution in the interests of all oppressed mankind—7.

VIII. In order to substitute socialist for commodity production the proletariat must have command of *political power—dictatorship of the proletariat*—8.

IX. The working-class movement has become international—10.

X. Russian Social-Democracy is part of international Social-Democracy—11.

XI. Russian Social-Democracy pursues the same ultimate aim. The task of Russian Social-Democracy is to

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text{expose the irreconcilable character of the interests}\\ \text{explain the importance of the social revolution}\\ \text{organise the workers' forces}\end{array}\right\}\text{—9.}$$

XII. The immediate aim is modified by the remnants of the serf-owning system (a burden on the entire working population + the main obstacle hindering the working-class movement).

XIII. It is necessary to work for juridical institutions constituting a complement to capitalism.

XIV. Autocracy—a remnant of the serf-owning system, the bitterest enemy; hence the immediate task is to overthrow the *monarchy*.

AMENDMENTS TO PLEKHANOV'S DRAFT PROGRAMME

	Proposed 21.1.02	
III. [The capitalist production relations weigh more and more heavily on the working class, as] technical pro-	III. Technical progress (by increasing the productivity of labour?) not only gives the capitalists the material pos-	"allows"

gress, [by increasing the productivity of labour,] not only, etc. {instead of occasioning—*engendering*}

+ The growth of unemployment, poverty, degradation and oppression is the inevitable result of this basic tendency of capitalism.

sibility of intensifying their exploitation of the workers, but converts this possibility into reality, engendering a relative reduction in the *demand* for labour-power simultaneously with a relative and absolute increase in its supply. The growth of unemployment, poverty, oppression and degradation is the inevitable result of this basic tendency of capitalism.

(of the said basic tendencies)

Make §5.

Incorrect: not all.

IV. Thus, the development of the productive forces of social labour is attended by the monopolisation of all the advantages of this development by a negligible minority, with the growth of social wealth proceeding side by side with the growth of social inequality, with the gulf between the propertied and the propertyless, between the class of property-owners and the class of the proletariat, growing.

Make §4.

V.* An even greater worsening of the condition of the working class and the petty producers is engendered by the industrial crises, which are the inevitable outcome of the said contradictions of capitalism,

in the absence of social control over production and owing to the constantly growing

owing to the lack of balanced development of production, and the growth of rivalry

With such a state of affairs in society, in the absence of balanced development of pro-

* "An even greater sharpening of these contradictions" is crossed out as an opening phrase in the MS.—*Ed*.

rivalry among the capitalist countries on the world market.*

among the capitalist countries on the world market. The poverty and destitution of the masses are accompanied by a waste of social wealth because markets are not to be found for the commodities produced.

duction, with the constantly growing rivalry among the capitalist countries on the world market, the sale of commodities necessarily lags behind their production.*

Written not later than January 8 (21), 1902

First published in 1924 in *Lenin Miscellany II*

Printed from the original

3

RECORD OF POINTS ONE AND TWO OF PLEKHANOV'S FIRST DRAFT PROGRAMME, AND OUTLINE OF POINT ONE OF THE PROGRAMME'S THEORETICAL SECTION

I. The capitalist mode of production is the economic foundation of contemporary bourgeois society, under which the most important part of the means of production and circulation of products, made in the form of commodities, is the private property of a relatively small class of persons, whereas the majority of the population cannot subsist except by selling their labour-power. In consequence of this, they find themselves in the dependent condition of wage-workers (proletarians) by their labour creating the income of the owners of the means of production and the circulation of commodities (capitalists and big landowners).

II. The sphere of domination of the capitalist mode of production is expanding, as the continuous technical progress increases the economic importance of the big enterprises and thereby decreases the role of independent small producers in the economic life of society, depressing their living standard, displacing some into the ranks of the proletariat, and turning others into direct or indirect vassals and tributaries of capital.

* *
*

* This variant is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

I (?). Russia's economic development is leading to an ever greater spread and ever greater domination within || ? || her of capitalist relations of production.

Written not later than January 8 (21), 1902

First published in 1959 in Vol. 6 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

4

INITIAL VARIANT OF THE THEORETICAL SECTION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME

INITIAL FORMULATION	AMENDED FORMULATION
A.	
I. Russia's economic development and her increasing (intensified) involvement in international trade are leading to an ever greater spread within her and to ever fuller domination of the capitalist mode of production.	I. Russia's intensified involvement in international trade and the growth of commodity production inside the country {Reword} are leading to ever fuller domination within her of the capitalist mode of production, which is distinguished by the following basic features.
II.* Continuous technical progress is increasing the economic importance of the big enterprises and reducing the role of the independent small producers (peasants, artisans, handicraftsmen, et al.) in the country's economic life, depressing their living standard, turning some of them into direct or indirect vassal and tribu-	III. Continuous technical progress is increasing the number, size and economic importance of the big capitalist enterprises, and is depressing the living standard of the independent small producers (peasants, artisans, handicraftsmen), turning some of them into vassals and tributaries of capital, totally ruining others and displac-

* In the original § II and § III are transposed in blue pencil.—*Ed.*

taries of capital, and displacing others into the ranks of the propertyless class (the proletariat), which is deprived of the means of production.

ing them into the ranks of the propertyless class (the proletariat), which is deprived of the means of production.

III. The most important part of the means of production and the circulation of commodities is increasingly concentrated in the hands of a relatively small class of persons, whereas an ever growing majority of the population are unable to maintain their existence otherwise than by selling their labour-power. In consequence of this, they find themselves in the dependent condition of wage-workers (proletarians), who by their labour create the income of the owners of the means of production and the circulation of commodities (capitalists and big landowners).

IV. By increasing the productivity of labour, technical progress enables the capitalists to intensify their exploitation of the workers, engendering a relative reduction in the demand for labour-power (that is, the increase in demand is not proportional to [lags behind] the increase in capital) simultaneously with a relative and absolute increase in its supply. This, together with the above-mentioned basic tendencies of capitalism, leads to a growth of unemployment, poverty exploitation, oppression and degradation.

V. The condition of the working class and the small producers is even further worsened by the industrial crises, which are the inevitable outcome of the said contradictions of capitalism, by the lack of balanced development of production, which is intrinsic to it (and which no associations of industrialists can eliminate), and by the growth of rivalry among the capitalist countries on the world market. Poverty and destitution of the masses exist side by side with a waste of social wealth in consequence of the impossibility of finding markets for the commodities produced.

VI. Thus, the development of the productive forces of social {Reword} labour is attended

VI. Thus, the gigantic development of the productive forces of social and increasingly socialised labour is attended

by the monopolisation of all the principal advantages of this development by a negligible minority of the population, with the growth of social wealth proceeding side by side with the growth of social inequality, with the gulf between the propertied and propertyless, between the class of property-owners (the bourgeoisie) and the class of the proletariat, growing.

VII. But as all these inevitable contradictions of capitalism increase and develop,

the discontent and indignation of the working class also grow, and its solidarity increases, in virtue of the very conditions of the capitalist mode of production,

the number and the solidarity of the proletarians, their discontent and indignation grow,

the struggle between the working class and the capitalist class becomes sharper and the urge to throw off the intolerable yoke of capitalism mounts.

VIII. The emancipation of the workers must be an act of the working class itself. If the yoke of capitalism is to be thrown off, there must be a social revolution, that is,

VIII. The emancipation of the workers must be an act of the working class itself, because all the other classes of present-day society stand for the preservation of the foundations of the existing economic system.

The real emancipation of the working class requires a social revolution, naturally flowing from the entire development of the capitalist mode of production, that is, the abolition of private ownership of the means of production, their conversion into public property and the replacement of the capitalist production of commodities by the socialist organisation of the production of commodities by society as a whole, with the object of ensuring full well-being and free all-round development for all its members.

IX. To effect this social revolution the proletariat must

win *political power*, which will make it master of the situation and enable it to remove all obstacles along the road to its great goal. In this sense the *dictatorship of the proletariat* is an essential political condition of the social revolution.

X. The revolution of the proletariat will mean the emancipation of all the now oppressed and suffering mankind, because it will put an end to all types of oppression and exploitation of man by man.

XI. Russian Social-Democracy undertakes the task of disclosing to the workers the irreconcilable antagonism between their interests and those of the capitalists, of explaining to the proletariat the historical significance, nature and prerequisites of the social revolution it will have to carry out, and of organising a revolutionary class party capable of directing the struggle of the proletariat in all its forms against the present social and political system.

XII. But the development of international exchange and of production for the world market has established (created) such close ties among all the nations of the civilised (?) world, that the great aim of the proletariat's emancipation struggle can be achieved only through the joint efforts of proletarians in all countries. That is why* the present-day working-class movement had to become, and has long since become, an international movement, and Russian Social-Democracy regards itself as one of the detachments of the world army of the proletariat, as *part of international Social-Democracy*.

B.

I. The immediate aims of Russian Social-Democracy are, however, considerably modified by the fact that in our country numerous remnants of the pre-capitalist, serf-owning, social system retard the development of the productive forces in the highest degree, and lower the working population's standard of living; they are responsible for the Asiatically barbarous way in which the many-million-strong peasantry is dying out, and keep the entire people

---

* The words "the great aim of the proletariat's emancipation struggle can be achieved only through the joint efforts of proletarians in all countries. That is why" are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

in a state of ignorance and subjection, denying them all rights. The Russian Social-Democrats still have to work for the free civic and political institutions which already exist in the leading capitalist countries and which are undoubtedly necessary for the full and all-round development of the proletariat's class struggle against the bourgeoisie.*

II. The most outstanding of these remnants of the serf-owning system and the most formidable bulwark of all that barbarism and all the calamities of which the politically free countries are already rid, is the tsarist autocracy; it is the bitterest and most dangerous enemy of the proletarian emancipation movement.	The tsarist autocracy is the most outstanding of these remnants of the serf-owning system and the most formidable bulwark of all this barbarism. It is the bitterest and most dangerous enemy of the proletarian emancipation movement and the cultural development of the entire people.

For these reasons Russian Social-Democracy advances as its immediate political task the overthrow of the tsarist autocracy and its replacement by a *republic* based on a democratic constitution that would ensure:

1) the people's sovereignty, that is....

Written between January 8 and 25 (January 21 and February 7), 1902

First published in 1924 in *Lenin Miscellany II*

Printed from the original

5

OUTLINES OF PLAN OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME

I-VI. A) Russia's economic development and the principal features of capitalism.

VII-XII. B) The proletariat's class struggle and the tasks of the Social-Democrats.

C) The immediate aims of the Russian Social-Democrats and their political demands.

D) Social (factory) reforms.

* This sentence is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

E) Financial reform and demands with a view to eliminating the survivals of the serf society.
F) Conclusion ("tailpiece").

A) Russia's economic development and the general tasks of the Social-Democrats.
B) The special political tasks and political demands of the Social-Democrats.
C) Social reforms.
D) Financial and peasant transformations (reforms).

Written between January 8 and 25 (January 21 and February 7), 1902

First published in 1924 in *Lenin Miscellany II*

Printed from the original

6

INITIAL VARIANT OF THE AGRARIAN SECTION AND THE CONCLUDING SECTION OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME

Besides, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party demands:

a) in the interests of organising the state economy on democratic lines—abolition of all indirect taxes and establishment of a progressive income-tax

b) in the interests of eradicating all the remnants of the old serf-owning system

1) abolition of land redemption and quit-rent payments as well as of all services now imposed on the peasantry as a taxable social-estate

2) annulment of collective liability and of all laws restricting the peasant in the free disposal of his land;

3) restitution to the people of all amounts taken from them in the form of land redemption and quit-rent payments, confiscation for this purpose of monasterial property and of the royal demesnes,[15] and imposition of a special land tax on members of the big landed nobility who received land redemption loans, the revenue thus obtained to be credited to a special public fund for the cultural and charitable needs of the village communes;

4) establishment of peasant committees

a) for the restitution to the village communes (by expropriation or, when the land has changed hands, by redemption, etc.) of the land cut off from the peasants when serfdom was abolished and now used by the landlords as a means of keeping the peasants in bondage;

b) for the eradication of the remnants of the serf-owning system which still exist in the Urals, the Altai, the Western territory and other regions of the country;

5) empowering of the courts to reduce exorbitant rents and declare null and void contracts entailing bondage.

The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party believes that the complete, consistent and lasting implementation of the indicated political and social changes can be achieved only by overthrowing the autocracy and convoking a constituent assembly, freely elected by the whole people.

Written not later than January 25 (February 7), 1902

First published in 1959 in Vol. 6 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

7

OUTLINES OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME

VARIANT 1

Commodity production is ever more rapidly developing in Russia, her participation in international trade is increasing* and the capitalist mode of production is becoming increasingly dominant.

A growing majority of the population are unable to maintain their existence otherwise than by selling their labour-power. In consequence of this they find themselves in the condition of wage-workers (proletarians) dependent on a relatively small class of capitalists and big landowners, who hold the most important part of the means of production and circulation of commodities.**

---

* The words "her participation in international trade is increasing" are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

** This paragraph is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

The most important part of the means of production is becoming concentrated in the hands of an insignificant minority of capitalists and big landowners as their private property. Ever greater numbers of working men losing their means of production are forced to resort to the sale of their labour-power. In this way they find themselves in the dependent condition of wage-workers (proletarians), who by their labour create the income of the property-owners.

The development of capitalism is increasing the number, size and economic importance of the big enterprises, and is depressing the living standard of the independent small producers (peasants, artisans, handicraftsmen), turning some of them into vassals and tributaries of capital and displacing others into the ranks of the proletariat.

The higher the level of technical progress, the more the growth of the demand for labour-power lags behind the growth of its supply, and the greater are the opportunities for the capitalists to intensify exploitation of the workers.

The growth of poverty, unemployment, exploitation, oppression and humiliation is the result of the basic tendencies of capitalism.

Insecurity of existence, unemployment, the yoke of exploitation and humiliation of every kind are becoming the lot of ever wider sections of the working population.

This process is still more aggravated by industrial crises, which are the inevitable outcome of the said contradictions of capitalism. Poverty and destitution of the masses exist side by side with a waste of social wealth in consequence of the impossibility of finding markets for the commodities produced.

Thus, the gigantic development of the productive forces of social and increasingly socialised labour is attended by monopolisation of all the principal advantages of this development by a negligible minority of the population. The growth of social wealth proceeds side by side with the growth of social inequality; the gulf between the class of property-owners (the bourgeoisie) and the class of the proletariat is growing.

(A) §III. Small-scale production is being ousted to an ever greater degree by large-scale production. The independent small producers (peasants, artisans and handicraftsmen)

are being turned either into proletarians or vassals and tributaries of capital.

As the result of continuous technical progress small-scale production is being ousted to an ever greater degree by large-scale production. The most important part of the means of production (of the land and factories, tools and machinery, railways and other means of communication) is becoming concentrated in the hands of a relatively insignificant number of capitalists and big landowners as their private property. The independent small producers (peasants, artisans and handicraftsmen) are being ruined in growing numbers, losing their means of production and thus turning into proletarians or else becoming servants and tributaries of capital. Increasing numbers of working people are compelled to sell their labour-power.

In this way they become wage-workers who are dependent on the property-owners and by their labour create the wealth of the latter.

These wage-workers (proletarians) thus find themselves in a condition of dependence on the property-owners, and by their labour create the income of the latter.

VARIANT 2

Commodity production is ever more rapidly developing in Russia, the capitalist mode of production becoming increasingly dominant.

The most important part of the means of production (of the land and factories, tools and machinery, railways and other means of communication) is becoming concentrated in the hands of a relatively insignificant number of capitalists and big landowners as their private property.

Increasing numbers of working people losing their means of production are compelled to sell their labour power. These wage-workers (proletarians) thus find themselves in a condition of dependence on the

Increasing numbers of working people are compelled to sell their labour-power and become wage-workers who are dependent on the property-owners, and by their labour create the wealth of the latter.

property-owners, and by their labour create the income of the latter.

The development of capitalism is increasing the number, size and economic importance of the big enterprises, is worsening the condition of the independent small producers (peasants, artisans, handicraftsmen), turning some of them into vassals and tributaries of capital, and displacing others into the ranks of the proletariat.

The higher the level of technical progress, the more the growth of the demand for labour-power lags behind the growth of its supply, and the greater are the opportunities for the capitalists to intensify exploitation of the workers. Insecurity of existence and unemployment, the yoke of exploitation, and humiliation of every kind are becoming the lot of ever wider sections of the working population.

This process is being still more aggravated by industrial crises, which are the inevitable outcome of the basic contradictions of capitalism. Poverty and destitution of the masses exist side by side with a waste of social wealth in consequence of the impossibility of finding markets for the commodities produced.

Thus, the gigantic development of the productive forces of social and increasingly socialised labour is attended by monopolisation of all the principal advantages of this development by a negligible minority of the population. The growth of social wealth proceeds side by side with the growth of social inequality; the gulf between the class of property-owners (the bourgeoisie) and the class of the proletariat is growing.*

Written between January 25 and February 18 (February 7 and March 3), 1902

First published in 1924 in *Lenin Miscellany II*

Printed from the original

* On the back of the original is the following pencilled note: "...emphatically rejecting all those reformist plans which are connected with any extension or consolidation of tutelage of the working masses by the police and officials." This formulation was proposed by Lenin as an amendment to the concluding part of the Draft Programme of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (see present edition, Vol. 6, p. 31).—*Ed.*

8

ADDENDA TO THE AGRARIAN AND FACTORY SECTIONS OF THE DRAFT PROGRAMME

"But with a view to eradicating the remnants of the old serf-owning system it will work for."

Perhaps we should insert "and in the interests of free development of the class struggle in the countryside".

This is *prompted* by the fact that at this point, too, we must resolutely draw a line between ourselves and *bourgeois democracy*, whose every shade will, of course, willingly subscribe to the former motivation alone.

* *
*

NB: add to the *factory* section:
that the law should establish weekly payments for workers under all manner of labour contracts.

Written between January 25 and February 18 (February 7 and March 3), 1902

First published in 1959 in Vol. 6 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

REPLIES TO PLEKHANOV'S AND AXELROD'S REMARKS ON THE ARTICLE "THE AGRARIAN PROGRAMME OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY"[16]

"4. establishment of peasant committees:

a) for the restitution to the village communes (by expropriation or, when the land has changed hands, by redemption, etc.) of the land cut off from the peasants when serfdom was abolished and now used by the landlords as a means of keeping the peasants in bondage...."*

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 110.—*Ed.*

Plekhanov. *NB*. Please note this: *expropriation* (No. 3) does not rule out *redemption*; *redemption* does not rule out *expropriation* (proof superfluous); "redemption, etc." (No. 2) is nothing but redemption—"etc." should be deleted. The words in brackets could be replaced by these (by redemption, if after 1861 the land [and not lands] (No. 1) has changed hands by sale). This will make it clear that in other cases restitution shall take place without compensation for the present owners. Where the land has changed hands by inheritance, or *donation*, or *exchange*, there should be no redemption. I think we shall have time to alter this.

Axelrod. *I agree*. P. A.

No. 1. Once you have "lands" in the programme it is bad grammar to say "land" in brackets.

No. 2. "etc." includes exchange of lands, and servitude for land, and redemarcation, *etc*. It would therefore be quite wrong to delete it.

No. 3. "Expropriation" normally implies *deprivation* of property, that is, taking away without compensation. So it is not all that strange to contrast it with redemption as it may appear to the author of the remarks.

"It is our duty to fight against all remnants of serf-owning relationships—that is beyond doubt to a Social-Democrat—and since these relationships are most intricately interwoven with bourgeois relationships, we are *obliged* to penetrate into the very core, if I may use the word, of this confusion, undeterred by the complexity of the task."*

Plekhanov. There is no need to ask for *permission* to obtain knowledge of the core.

? ?

"...the workers' section contains demands directed against the *bourgeoisie*, whereas the peasants' section contains demands directed against the *serf-owning landlords* (against the feudal lords, I would say, if the applicability of this term to our landed nobility were not so disputable[1]).

[1] Personally I am inclined to decide this question in the affirmative, but in the given instance, it is of course neither the place nor the time for substantiating or even for proposing this solution, since what we are concerned with now is defence of the draft agrarian programme prepared collectively by the entire Editorial Board."**

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 114.—*Ed*.
** Ibid., p. 116.—*Ed*.

Axelrod. NB. I do think that such hints at differences could be waived in a *programme* pamphlet.

"However, to try to determine in advance, before the final outcome of the struggle, in the course of that struggle, that we shall perhaps fail to achieve the *entire* maximum, means lapsing into sheer philistinism."*

Plekhanov. "Try to determine" that we shall fail to achieve the entire maximum, etc.—that is very ineptly phrased. I propose to substitute for it the phrase I wrote in the text. I request a *vote* on this proposal. *Motive*: fear of gibes from opponents.

I also propose a vote on my proposal to *delete* the author's considerations about Russian feudalism. *Motive*: such reasoning is irrelevant in a general, you might say, *editorial*, article. The author's reservations merely suggest a *difference of opinion* on the Editorial Board.

Axelrod. I already spoke out in this vein above.

A bit of tact would suggest to the author of the remarks that it is highly improper to insist on a *vote* of the *stylistic* changes he proposes (perhaps for the worse?). It is equally ridiculous to fear that over the minor question of "feudalism" (the Martynovs?) will raise a cry about a "difference of opinion". My statement was a very general one.

"'Our movement' is the Social-Democratic labour movement. The peasant *masses* cannot just be 'brought' *into it*: that is not problematic, but *impossible*, and there was never any question of it. However, the peasant masses *cannot but be brought* into the 'movement' against all the remnants of the serf-owning system (including the autocracy)."***

Plekhanov. I propose that instead of the words: "peasant masses (in the phrase about *bringing in*") we write: the

See 28 reverse.****

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 118.—*Ed.*

** Plekhanov proposed the following rewording: "However, to stop ourselves before the final outcome of the struggle, in the course of that struggle, on the strength of the consideration...."—*Ed.*

*** See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 118.—*Ed.*

**** See preceding reply to Plekhanov's remark.—*Ed.*

peasant mass as such, i.e., *as an estate*, and, moreover, regarded *as a single whole*, etc.

I request a vote on this.

Axelrod. I agree. P. A.

"We must spread the idea far and wide that only in a republic can the decisive battle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie take place; we must *create* and consolidate republican traditions among all the Russian revolutionaries and among the broadest possible masses of Russian workers; we should express through this "republic" slogan that we will carry to the end the struggle to democratise the state system, without looking back."*

Plekhanov. I advise the delation of the words: we must spread the idea that only in a republic can the decisive battle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie take place (*I request a vote on this*). I am not at all sure that in Britain, say political development must go through a republic. The monarchy there will hardly be a hindrance to the workers, so that its removal may turn out to be a *result* instead of a *preliminary condition* of the triumph of socialism.

Axelrod. In favour of the proposal. P. A.

The example of Britain is not very apt because of her exceptional position. To compare Russia with Britain *just now* is to sow great confusion among the public. The "necessity" of a republic is indicated by the remarks of Marx (1875) and Engels (1891) concerning the demand for a republic in Germany[17]—but there can always be exceptions.

"Hence, for the sake of simplicity, the entire content of Clause 4 may be briefly expressed as 'restitution of the cut-off lands'. The question arises: how did the idea of this demand originate? It arose as the direct outcome of the general and fundamental proposition that we must assist the peasants and urge them to destroy all remnants of the serf-owning system as completely as possible. This meets with 'general approval', doesn't it? Well then, if you do agree to follow this road, make an effort to proceed along it independently; don't make it necessary to drag you; don't let the 'unusual' appearance of this road frighten you;

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 120.—*Ed.*

don't be put out by the fact that in many places you will find no beaten track at all, and that you will have to crawl along the edge of precipices, break your way through thickets, and leap across chasms. Don't complain of the poor road: these complaints will be futile whining, for you should have known in advance that you would be moving, not along a highway that has been graded and levelled by all the forces of social progress, but along paths, through out-of-the-way places and back-alleys which do have a way out, but from which you, we or anyone else will never find a direct, simple, and easy way out—'never', i.e., whilst these disappearing, but so slowly disappearing, out-of-the-way places and back-alleys continue to exist.

"But if you do not want to stray into these back-alleys, then say so frankly and don't try to get away by phrase-mongering."*

Plekhanov. I put to the vote the question of crossing out this page. It lends a somewhat feuilleton character to the reasoning, which in itself is clear and consistent. In order to put forward the demand for restitution of the cut-off lands, there is no need "to crawl along the edge of precipices", etc. This imagery suggests that the author himself has not quite tied in the "cut-off lands" with his own orthodoxy.

Axelrod. I propose we leave out this page, starting from the words: "This meets..." to the end of the following page (47). P. A.

I put to the vote the question of whether it is *proper* to use such *cancan*-toned remarks in respect of a colleague. And where is it going to get us if we *all* start cudgelling each other **in that way??**

"Direct survivals of the corvée system, recorded times without number in all the economic surveys of Russia, are maintained, not by any special law which protects them, but by the actually existing land relationships. This is so to such an extent that witnesses testifying before the well-known Valuyev Commission[18] openly stated that serf-ownership would undoubtedly have been revived had it not

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 127.—*Ed.*

been directly prohibited by law. Hence, one of two things: either you refrain altogether from touching upon the land relationships between the peasants and the landlords—in which case all the remaining questions are solved very 'simply', but then you will also be ignoring the main source of all the survivals of the serf-owning economy in the countryside, and will 'simply' be avoiding a burning question bearing on the most vital interests of the feudal landlords and the enslaved peasantry, a question which tomorrow or the day after may easily become one of the most pressing social and political issues in Russia. Or else you want also to touch upon the source of the 'obsolete forms of economic bondage' represented by the land relationships—in which case you must reckon with the fact that these relationships are so complex and entangled that they do not actually permit of any easy or simple solution. Then, if you are not satisfied with the concrete solution we have proposed for this complex question, you *no* longer have the *right* to get away with a general 'complaint' about its complexity, but *must* attempt to cope with it independently, and propose some other concrete solution.

"The importance of the cut-off lands in present-day peasant farming is a question of reality."*

Plekhanov. I would advise throwing out all the reasoning about "simplicity" and "non-simplicity", and continuing the article with the words: "The importance of the cut-off lands...." The article will gain therefrom, because this whole passage spoils it by being terribly (??) dragged out. I propose a vote.

The reasoning about simplicity, as a summing up of the foregoing (and as a reply to a *host* of remarks made by those even who sympathise with us), is not at all superfluous, and I suggest we leave it in.

"Labour rent makes for stagnation in cultivation techniques and for stagnation in *all* social and economic relationships in the countryside, since this labour rent hampers the development of a money economy and the differentiation of the peasantry, disembarrasses the landlord (comparatively) of the stimulus of competition (instead of raising the technical level, he reduces the share of the sharecropper; incidental-

* See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 128.—*Ed.*

ly, this reduction has been recorded in a number of localities for many years of the post-Reform period), ties the peasant to the land, thereby checking the progress of migration, outside employment, etc."*

Plekhanov. I propose to delete the words: "and the differentiation of the peasantry"; they could bias the reader against a measure which in itself merits every approval. If you insist on leaving these words in, elaborate on them, explaining (even if only in a footnote) what you mean by them. I request a vote.

Furthermore: what means "comparatively disembarrasses"? The word "comparatively" does not fit in here.

How? *Whom?* Why?—this baffles all understanding.

It's quite plain. It means: it disembarrasses *relative* to the current state in Russia (and not as compared with, say, America).

"And in general: once it is generally acknowledged that the cut-off lands are one of the principal roots of the labour-rent system—and this system is a direct survival of serf-ownership which retards the development of capitalism—how can one doubt that the restitution of the cut-off lands will undermine the labour-rent system and accelerate social and economic progress?"**

Plekhanov. That is just why there is no need to go to such lengths to prove this.

A hasty conclusion. See end of this (55) and beginning of the next page.***

"As far as I can judge, *all* objections 'against the cut-off lands' fit into one or another of these four groups; moreover, most of the objectors (including Martynov) have answered all four questions in the negative, considering the demand for the restitution of the cut-off lands wrong in principle, politically inexpedient, practically unattainable, and logically inconsistent."****

---

* See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 129-30.—*Ed.*

** Ibid., p. 130.—*Ed.*

*** Lenin means the beginning of Chapter VII of his article (ibid., p. 130).—*Ed.*

**** Ibid., p. 131.—*Ed.*

Plekhanov. I propose that Martynov should be deleted: there's much too much of him stuck in all over the place.
Axelrod. Indeed, des Guten, i.e., Martynov, mehr als zu viel.* P. A.

See p. 28 reverse.**

Martynov has cited arguments reiterated by very many of our friends. It would be highly *tactless* to let these arguments go, without replying to them, and to refrain from mentioning Martynov, when he speaks to the point.

"And we shall not be in the least contradicting ourselves if we delete from our programme the struggle against the remnants of the serf-owning system in the subsequent historical period when the special features of the present social and political 'juncture' will have disappeared, when the peasants, let us suppose, will have been satisfied by insignificant concessions made to an insignificant number of property-owners and begin definitely to 'snarl' at the proletariat. Then, we shall probably also have to delete from our programme the struggle against the autocracy, for it is quite inconceivable that the peasants will succeed in ridding themselves of the most repulsive and grievous form of feudal oppression *before* political liberty has been attained."***

Plekhanov. I propose we *throw out* the part starting with the words: "And we shall not be..." and ending with: "...has been attained." Instead of *reinforcing*, they *weaken* the conviction carried by the foregoing.
Axelrod. In favour. P. A.

These words should stand, for they arise out of a *necessary* precaution. Otherwise, we could later be very well accused of lack of foresight.

"It may be argued: 'However slowly the labour-rent farming may be yielding to the pressure of capitalism, still it is yielding; it is, moreover, doomed to disappear completely; large-scale labour-rent farming is giving way to, and

---

* Too much of a good thing.—*Ed.*
** A reference to Lenin's reply to Plekhanov's remark on p. 55 of this volume.—*Ed.*
*** See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 132-33.—*Ed.*

will be directly replaced by, large-scale capitalist farming. What you want is to accelerate the elimination of serf-owning by a measure which in essence amounts to the splitting-up (partial, but nevertheless splitting-up) of large-scale farms. Are you not thereby sacrificing the interests of the future to the interests of the present? For the sake of the problematic possibility of a peasant revolt against serf-owning in the immediate future, you are placing obstacles in the way of a revolt of the agricultural proletariat against capitalism in the more or less distant future!'

"This argument, however convincing it may seem at first glance, is very one-sided...."*

Plekhanov. It's pretty unconvincing even at first glance. It reeks of such wild pedantry, that the least said of it the better: I blush for the Social-Democrats. This sense of shame is the stronger now that thousands of Russian peasants are *rising up* to liquidate the old order. I request a vote on the proposal to declare this argument unconvincing even at first glance.

Axelrod. I believe we should throw out the compliment to our opponents à la Martynov. P. A.

I think it is ridiculous to see this as a "compliment to our opponents", when they are being refuted (this is even actually wrong, because the argument was repeated in their letters by *Iskra*'s closest friends). Besides, there's no point at all in the *abuse* heaped on them by the author of the remarks.

"...this *could not fail to exert the profoundest influence* on the spirit of protest and the independent struggle of the entire rural working population".**

Plekhanov. What does "independent struggle" mean?

See Belgium in April 1902.[19] She provides the answer to this "difficult" question.

"And in order to facilitate for our farm labourers and semi-farm labourers the subsequent transition to socialism, it is highly important that the socialist party begin to 'stand up' *at once* for the small peasants, and do 'everything possible' for them, never refusing a hand in solving the

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 133.—*Ed.*
** Ibid., p. 134.—*Ed.*

urgent and complex 'alien' (non-proletarian) problems, and helping the working and exploited masses to regard the socialist party as their leader and representative."*

Plekhanov. Why are the words "everything possible" in inverted commas ("quotes")? I don't understand. Besides, the question of "semi-farm labourers" is not at all an alien one for the proletariat. It is now extremely bad policy to use this word, even in quotes.

Is it so hard to understand that everyone has his own way of using quotes? Perhaps the author of the remarks will want to "*vote*" on the quotes as well? I shouldn't be at all surprised!

"It is the Russian bourgeoisie who were 'late' with what is really *their* task of sweeping away all the remnants of the old regime, and we must and shall rectify this omission until it has been rectified, until we have won political liberty, as long as the position of the peasants continues to foster dissatisfaction among practically the whole of educated bourgeois society (as is the case in Russia), instead of fostering a feeling of conservative self-satisfaction among it on account of the 'indestructibility' of what is supposed to be the strongest bulwark against socialism (as is the case in the West where this self-satisfaction is displayed by all the parties of Order, ranging from the agrarians and conservatives pur sang, through the liberal and free-thinking bourgeois, to even as far—without offence to Messrs. the Chernovs and the *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii*![20]—to even as far as the fashionable 'critics of Marxism' in the agrarian question)."**

Plekhanov. *I strongly advise* that we throw out here the words "*Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii*". They stand alongside Chernov's name, and we could be accused of carelessly bringing the two together, giving a hint, and almost divulging a pseudonym. This should be avoided at all costs.

I agree, but I prefer to throw out "the Chernovs".

"Nationalisation of the land is a different matter. This demand (if it is interpreted in the bourgeois sense, and not

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 134.—*Ed.*
** Ibid., pp. 135-36.—*Ed.*

in the socialist) does actually 'go further' than the demand for the restitution of the cut-off lands, and in principle we fully endorse it. It goes without saying that, when the revolutionary moment comes, we shall not fail to advance it."*

Plekhanov. I quite adhere to this remark.[21] That's the "*crux*" of the matter.

Axelrod. I don't quite understand. Above you gave an excellent definition of the social-revolutionary character of the agrarian programme; besides nationalisation of the land is now anti-revolutionary even as a slogan for an *uprising*. I agree with Berg's proposal.

It's a pity the "adherent" quite forgot that the remark related to the *unedited* article. Just a little attention would have spared him this amusing mistake.

"But our present programme is being drawn up, not only for the period of revolutionary insurrection, not even so much for that period, as for the period of political slavery, for the period that precedes political liberty. However, in this period the demand for the nationalisation of the land is *much less* expressive of the immediate tasks of the democratic movement in the meaning of a struggle against the serf-owning system."**

Plekhanov. The point made above was that our agrarian programme is a social-revolutionary one.

Nationalisation of the land in a police state would mean a fresh and vast increase of that state. That is why it is not right to say, as the author says here, "much less expressive", etc. One measure is *revolutionary* and the other *reactionary*.

Axelrod. Plekhanov's proposal coincides with the meaning of Berg's remarks, and mine on the preceding page.

This is wrong. Nationalisation is not always "reactionary", regardless of time and character. That's an absurdity.

If the authors of the remarks refuse to take the

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 137.—*Ed.*
** Ibid., pp. 137-39.—*Ed.*

trouble to give a precise formulation to the amendments, even in a *second* reading (although this demand was specially accepted and communicated to all)—there will be endless delays through votes on "changes" in general (and then on the text of the changes??). It would be better to worry less about the author of a signed article *expressing* himself in his own manner.

"That is why we think that, on the basis of the present social system, the maximum demand in our agrarian programme should not go beyond the democratic revision of the Peasant Reform. The demand for nationalisation of the land, while quite valid in principle and quite suitable at certain moments, is politically inexpedient at the present moment."*

Plekhanov. *I agree* with Berg's remark.[22] But I propose this wording: in a police state, *nationalisation* of the land is harmful, and in a constitutional one it will be *a part* of the demand for the nationalisation of *all the means* of production. *I request a vote.*

Axelrod. I agree. P. A.

See p. 75 reverse.**

"Such composition of the courts would be a guarantee both of their democratic nature and free expression of the different class interests of the various sections of the rural population."***

Plekhanov. The style here is terrible. I propose a vote on improving it.

Axelrod. How?

A "terrible" concept of the "voting" game! It looks as if we have nothing better to do!

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 138.—*Ed.*

** A reference to Lenin's reply to Plekhanov's remark on p. 63 of this volume.—*Ed.*

*** See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 140.—*Ed.*

"...it is well known that in our countryside rent is more often of a serf-owning than a bourgeois nature; it is much more "money" rent (i.e., a modified form of feudal rent) than capitalist rent (i.e., the surplus over and above the profit of the employer). Reductions of rent would therefore directly help to replace serf-owning forms of farming by capitalist forms."*

Plekhanov. The author promised not to speak of Russian feudalism (see above), but has failed to keep his promise. That's a pity. I request a *vote* on the proposal to delete here the word *feudal* (rent).

That's not true. If you do take a look above, you will find that the author "promised" nothing of the sort. Once the author has made the specific reservation that this is *not a general opinion*, the quibbling here is doubly tactless.

"Even the autocracy has therefore been obliged more and more frequently to institute a special fund (utterly trifling, of course, and going more to line the pockets of embezzlers of state property and bureaucrats than for the relief of the famine-stricken) 'for the cultural and charitable needs of the village communes'. We, too, cannot but demand, among other democratic reforms, that such a fund be established. That can scarcely be disputed."**

Plekhanov. This passage here about the "autocracy" is *extremely inappropriate*. After all, why should we look to it for example? As if we are unable to make any proposals without looking to it for a cue?

The restitution to the peasants should be motivated by it being a revolutionary measure, rectifying an "*injustice*" which is not only still in everyone's mind, but which largely served to ruin the Russian peasant (cf. Martynov).

P.S. When the French émigrés demanded their billion (at

That *even* the autocracy has been obliged to go in for charity (in the smallest way) is *a fact*, fear of reference to which is rather strange. That this is put forward as an "example", is a "poor invention" by a man who wants to quibble.

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 141.—*Ed.*
** Ibid., p. 142.—*Ed.*

the time of the Restoration)[23] they said nothing about charity. They had a better understanding of the class struggle.

I propose a vote on the proposal to rewrite this passage.

Axelrod. Cf. Plekhanov's remark to p. 90.[24] Read that and these remarks carefully and you will agree with them. P. A.

"But, then—the objection is raised—this tribute *cannot* be returned in full. Quite so (*just as the cut-off lands cannot be restituted in full*)."*

Plekhanov. Why can't the cut-off lands be restituted in full? The programme says nothing about it.

I call everyone's attention to the fact that the meaning of the paragraph we adopted has been changed here.

Axelrod. Why do you restrict and weaken a principled decision by an insertion?

That's absolutely wrong. Lenin's insertion in his article does not alter the meaning of *what the programme says*, and *cannot* do so. The author of the remarks has forgotten the elementary truth that "it is the law, and not the motives of the law, that is subject to application".

"Actually, of course, the annulment of collective liability (Mr. Witte may manage to put this particular reform through before the revolution), the abolition of division into social-estates, freedom of movement, and the right for each individual peasant freely to dispose of his land will rapidly and inevitably bring about the removal of the burden of taxation and serf-bondage that the land commune to a three-fourths extent constitutes at the present time. But this result will only prove the correctness of our views on the village commune, prove how incompatible it is with the entire social and economic development of capitalism."**

Plekhanov. There is now talk of its destruction. The relevant phrase should therefore be changed.

"Therefore" has nothing to do with it. The "talk" has been going on for quite some

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 143.—*Ed.*
** Ibid., p. 144.—*Ed.*

I propose that instead of "capitalism" we say: "with all the social and economic development of our time". *Motive*: this will spare us any "demagogic criticism" by the proponents of the commune.

time, and *even if it does lead to some action*, still nothing need be altered there.

I find this fear of "demagogy" absolutely unwarranted, because these gentlemen will always come up with similarly "*bad* criticism".

"To this we reply that it does not at all follow from our formulation that every peasant must necessarily demand that a separate plot of land be allotted to him. What does follow is only liberty to sell the land; moreover, the preferential right of the commune members to purchase land that is being sold does not run counter to this liberty."*

Plekhanov. I quite agree with this remark,[25] and propose that it be put to the vote.

Axelrod. In favour.

"I agree" with what related to a deleted passage??!!?? A very fine proposal for a "vote", indeed!

"This objection would be groundless. Our demands do not destroy the association but, on the contrary, set up in place of the archaic (de facto semi-feudal) power of the commune over the muzhik, the power of a *modern* association over its members who join of their own accord. Nor, in particular, is our formulation at variance with the recognition, for instance, of fellow members' having the pre-emptive right, on certain terms, to buy the land put up for sale by a fellow member."

Plekhanov. I don't agree with this. This right would merely depreciate the peasant's land.

As for collective liability, it has partially already been abolished, and the rest will be abolished by Mr. Witte any day now.

Contradiction. I fail to understand: on the one hand, I *freely* enter an association and *freely* withdraw from it. On the other,

The author of the remarks overdoes his hostility to the commune. On this point great care must be taken to keep out of the embrace of Messrs. A. Skvortsov & Co. (into which the author of the remarks falls). *On certain terms*, the right of pre-emption may increase instead

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 145.—*Ed*.

the commune has a pre-emptive right to buy my land. *There's a contradiction in this.*

of decreasing the value of the land. My expression is deliberately broader and more general, whereas the author of the remarks is in too much of a hurry to cut the Gordian knot. By carelessly "denying" the commune (*as an association*) we may easily spoil all our "good will" to the peasant. After all, the commune is also connected with the conventional type of *settlement*, and so on, and only the A. Skvortsovs "remake" this in their projects with the stroke of a pen.

"To clear the way for the free development of the class struggle in the countryside, it is necessary to remove all remnants of serfdom, which now *overlie* the beginnings of capitalist antagonisms among the rural population, and keep them from developing."*

Plekhanov. This is the first time I see the word *antagonism* used in the *plural*.

The author of the remarks should not imagine that he is past seeing anything for the first time.

* * *

This alone is made fully clear by the remarks of the "author of the remarks". If he set himself the task of making it *impossible* for comrades who disagree with him, even on trifling matters, to work together with him on the board, he is rapidly and very surely moving towards that noble goal. But if he does reach it, he himself should bear the consequences.

(1) The remarks are written in such a careless manner that no effort has even been made to compare what there was before and what there is after the corrections.

* See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 146.—*Ed.*

(2) In fact, the list of corrections has simply been *thrown out*! "Don't buck me."

(3) Hardly *any of the alterations* proposed by the author of the remarks has been formulated by him personally—*contrary to the specified condition* adopted of necessity to avoid intolerable delays.

(4) The tone of the remarks is deliberately abusive. If I adopted such a tone in "analysing" Plekhanov's article on the programme (i.e., his *personal* "*article*" and not the draft of a general statement, a general programme, etc.) that would at once be the end of our collaboration. And so I "put to the vote": are members of the board to be allowed to *provoke* other members into doing so?

(5) It is the summit of tactlessness to use *votings* to interfere in the very manner in which the members of the board express themselves.

The author of the remarks puts me in mind of a coachman who thinks that to steer well, the horses have to be reined in and brought up as often and as hard as possible. Of course, I am nothing more than a horse, one *of* the horses of the coachman—Plekhanov—but even the most harassed horse may throw off the much too spirited coachman.

Written on May 1 (14), 1902

First published in 1925 in *Lenin Miscellany III*

Printed from the original

INTRODUCTION TO THE LEAFLET OF THE DON COMMITTEE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. "TO THE CITIZENS OF RUSSIA"[26]

We give in full the splendid proclamation issued by the Don Committee of our Party. It shows that the Social-Democrats know how to appreciate the heroic behaviour of men like Balmashev, without, however, falling into the error of the Socialist-Revolutionaries.[27] The Social-Democrats bring to the fore the workers' (and peasants') movement. They make their demands on the government on behalf of the working class and the whole people, but without issuing any threats of further attempts and assassinations. They

regard terrorism as one of the possible ancillary means, and not as a *special* tactical method justifying separation from revolutionary Social-Democracy.

Written after May 9 (22), 1902
First published in 1931 in V. Pleskov's book *V gody boyevoi yunosti. Molodyozh nakanune pervoi revolutsii* (Fighting Days of Youth. Young People on the Eve of the First Revolution), Molodaya Gvardia Publishers
Printed from the original

INTRODUCTION TO THE LEAFLET "TO THE CITIZENS OF ALL RUSSIA"[28]

The leaflet of the Don Committee, which we reprint, sums up some remarkable events and gives them a highly correct and striking assessment, drawing practical conclusions which Social-Democrats will never tire of repeating. It was published in 6,500 copies and sent to various towns of Russia in December.

Written on December 20, 1902 (January 2, 1903)
Published on January 1, 1903 in *Iskra* No. 31
Printed from the original

PLAN FOR A PAMPHLET AGAINST THE S.R.s[29]

The war is on. It is just beginning. Literary polemics. Why? Explain why war is inevitable.

Special attention should be devoted to theoretical differences involving principles.

A) *Middle-of-the-road and unprincipled stand between revolutionary Marxism and opportunist criticism.*

1. Article in No. 2 of *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii* (editorial). Its examination.
2. *Theory of cataclysm. Quote pp.* **55-56** = denial of the economic necessity of socialism. (Trusts forgotten.)

3. Agrarian question. Quote p. *57* ("even").
4. Theory of *value*. Quote p. *64*. "*Shaken*"! p. *66* ("even" once again!)
   {pp. 67 and 48—crisis of *all* socialism}
5. "*Violent and exceptional Marxism is becoming a part of history*" (*75*)!! NB
6. *Zhitlovsky in* "*Sozialistische Monatsheften*"....[30]
7. *Current Issue*. Praise of Hertz (note on p. 8).

> "New standpoint"=through co-operation to socialism.
>
> to B. 3.

8. *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii* No. 2, pp. 82 and 87. "Amendments", "revision", etc.*
9. Σ = total lack of principle. Anyone who wants to, can be a Socialist-Revolutionary.
10. Complete detachment from international socialism: "distinctive character".

B) *Middle-of-the-road and unprincipled stand between Russian Marxism and the Narodnaya Volya trend, rather: the liberal-Narodnik trend.*

1. The new revolutionary movement goes hand in hand with a struggle between the old theory and the new. Relics of Russian socialism (liberal-Narodnik trend) and Russian Marxism. What is the attitude of the Socialist-Revolutionaries? *The Eve of Revolution* is typical. (Total incomprehension of the importance of theoretical discussions.)
2. "Labour economy" (S.R theory) (from *Revolutsion-*

Degeneration of the old Russian socialism into a liberal-Narodnik trend.

* MS. indicates that point 8 is to go before point 6.—*Ed.*

naya Rossiya[31] No. 11, p. 7). *Vulgar socialism* + *Narodism*.
[Cf. *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii* No. 2, pp. 100-01: *class struggle*=*struggle of all the oppressed*!!]

3. Progressive and negative aspects of capitalism. *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* No. 9, p. 4.

Contra: *Progressive significance of migration and vagabondage*: No. 8, p. 8, column 2[32]

Special sheet, bottom of p. 2

Cf. *Current Issue* (p. 8): "*New* standpoint": "*Through co-operation to socialism*". Cf. A 7

From German statistics: co-operation= prevalence of the bourgeoisie.

4. Σ=purely eclectic combination of Narodism and Marxism with the aid of "criticism".

C) *Middle-of-the-road attitude to the class struggle and the working-class movement.*

1. From the theoretical errors of their stand they pass on to practical ones. Their attitude to the *class struggle* and the *working-class movement*. What is their approach?
2. Quotation from *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii* No. 2, *p. 224*. *Party* and *class*. Confusion, which means only one thing: moving away from the proletariat's class struggle and throwing open the door to an intelligentsia that is absolutely uncommitted and unstable.
3. *Intelligentsia* + *proletariat* + *peasantry* (No. 8, p. 6, column 2) (against "narrow" orthodoxy). Meaning= total denial of the class struggle. Confusion of different strata. Lumping together of intelligentsia's social reformism and a revolutionarism which is

merely democratic—and proletarian socialism—and crude peasant demands.

4. *Intelligentsia* and *proletariat*. And the Narodnaya Volya followers as well!!! *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii* No. 3—pp. 9-11. *Special sheet.*
5. Their attitude in practice? Illustrated by Economism.[33] *Iskra*: long process of work, persuasion, education. *Iskra*'s shedding of illusions about unity. Cf.: Gloating
   + Putting spokes in revolutionary Marxism's wheels.
   Σ = dilettante on the sidelines.
6. How they explain their distinction from the Social-Democrats? No. 9, p. 4, column 2.

{ The point is not that "they want to be", but that the *working-class movement* is there.
Labour in general is an absurdity.

{ Failure to make a distinction between hired and independent labour = vulgarisation of socialism by petty-bourgeois element and total obliteration of division from the Narodniks.
"A purely ideological representative" of a principle.
No principle at all!

D) *Regardless of their will, they are leading the working class towards subordination to bourgeois democracy.*

1. We have examined the theoretical stand of the S.R.s and their attitude to the working-class movement. Σ = middle-of-the-road stand, eclecticism.
2. Their attitude to Russian bourgeois democracy. There is none! *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii* No. 2, Cf. "Modern Vestal *p. 132*!! The S.R.s already Virgin".[34] noticed this during the war against the Economists.
3. What about Mr. Struve? What about the liberal-Narodnik trend? That's to whom they give in!!! It means that they give in to bourgeois democracy, failing to explain to the workers the class antitheses, and failing to work out an *independent* socialist *ideology*.

4. What means *intelligentsia* + *proletariat* + *peasantry*? In practice, the *intelligentsia* and the *peasantry* constitute nothing more than *bourgeois* democracy!!
5. What about their attitude to the liberals? Have another look at the + and — of capitalism formula (No. 9, p. 4).

There is no class underlying the liberals (No. 9, p. 4).

There is much more of it than you have!

Our fight against the liberals is much more acute than yours is.

Curious fact: *they took the liberals at their word*!! *No. 9, pp. 3-4* (V. V.'s variants)

We are engaged in a *war* and not in verbose reasoning: on the one hand, on the other hand.

But we realise that the liberals represent a class, that they are resilient, and they *have a social, popular* movement, which the S.R.s have not!!

6. L. M. in *Zarya* (No. 2-3) was right: the S.R.s have a twofold name because their socialism is not at all revolutionary and their revolutionism has nothing in common with socialism. *That is what leads to their defeats by bourgeois democracy.*

That is the end of the principled criticism of the *whole* S.R. *stand*. Let us note that we reject the whole of their stand and *not merely* their errors in the (agrarian) programme, *not merely* their errors in tactics (terrorism).

Warning against petty-bourgeois socialism, revolutionarism and vacillation.

E) *Agrarian question.*

1. Primitive vulgar socialism. Credulity. No analysis of the movement. Failure to understand the struggle against the rem-

NB

Unreadiness of *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii* against *Iskra*. *Current Issue* (Hertz). *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* No. 4, February,

nants of serfdom (No. 8, p. 4: the 1861 reforms have given scope to capitalism!!).

2. The peasantry's "equalitarian principle", etc., is merely labouring under a delusion of *democratic* demands. There is nothing socialist in it. You must tell the truth instead of stooping to demagogy.

bottom of p. 2: Polemics on the muzhik,[1] and No. 8 (*June*): call by the *Peasant Union*, etc. Indeed, you are less prepared than the Social-Democrats!

[1] The modern countryside can support and intensify the pressure on the government "and can probably do it more vigorously than we think, cut off as we have absolutely been in most cases from the muzhik for several years now because of government spying and oppression". *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* No. 4 (February 1902), p. 2.

3. "Socialisation of the land." Bourgeois nationalisation? (What about its significance in a class state?) "Socialisation of the land" is an empty *promise* (minimum!).
   After all this = *de facto* "*the people are prepared for revolution*" of the Narodnaya Volya.
4. *Co-operation* (instead of the class struggle!) is a purely (bourgeois-) *petty-bourgeois* demand.
5. For the commune. Against free disposal.
6. *Narodnoye Dyelo*[35] No. 2, pp. 18-19. How is the peasants' and workers' struggle to be united? *Narodnoye Dyelo* No. 2, p. 51: "in the common popular spirit". Unprintable.
   Narodnoye Dyelo No. 2, p. 63: "there should be duping wherever and whenever possible"!!
   Examples of duping: *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* No. 11, p. 6: have a snack and a drink of blood, pettifoggers and so on and so forth.

F) *Terrorism*.

1. Polemics over Balmashev. Unexampled.
   But isn't the criticism of the Germans unexampled?
   (First you breed dissatisfaction and then you yourself suggest that it should be voiced!!)
2. *Polemics over the April 3 proclamation. Quote* (*No. 11, bottom of p. 25*)[36] and a *fiction* deduced.
3. "*Vperyod*" *No. 5*. Quote, No. 5, pp. 7-8.

by the way, p. 9 [37]

4. Terrorism. Quote from No. 7 (idem as in the April 3 proclamation: it is not words we attach importance to). No. 7, p. 4: "Terrorism induces people to *think politically*."
   —"surer than months of propaganda"
   —"will instil strength into the discouraged".[38]

   The logic of terrorism: it is brought out into the forefront, then comes the rest. Proof: back in *February* 1902 it was not a fighting organisation that *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* (No. 4) brought out into the forefront. *See reverse* (α).*

5. "Not instead, but together." In practice there is *no* connection with the masses.
   Scepticism, lack of steadfastness. *4 years* (1897-1901), with the democratic period just beginning.

   Terrorism is not dangerous because there is a mass movement. "Frame of mind." Succumb to it? *See reverse* (β).**

   Distraction from immediate pressing tasks. *Leaders lagging behind the mass*.

   No. 12, column 1 on p. 3 ("theory of stages"). Ibid.: there should be no breaking into prisons.[39]

---

* The text marked (α) is on the reverse of the MS.—*Ed.*
** The text marked (β) is on the reverse of the MS.—*Ed.*

(α) "All the aspects of the revolutionary technique, methods of street fighting against the troops, *execution of the most hated servants of the tsar* (my italics), etc., *retreat into the background* before the most mature, most immediate and pressing problem: the establishment of a central revolutionary organisation" (*Revolutsionnaya Rossiya*, 1902, No. 4, February, p. 3). } What is the position today?

(β) "...While the scribes waged a paper struggle..." (whether it is right to attach merely an exciting or also a deterrent significance to terrorism) "...*life brought out into the forefront such a need* of terroristic means *that in face of it all earlier objections had to cease*. Terroristic acts became necessary as a means of self-defence..." *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* No. 7, p. 2 (June 1902).

G) *Conclusion.*

Tasks of contemporary revolutionaries:

α) Theoretical defence and development of revolutionary Marxism.

β) Utmost participation in international ideological struggle.

γ) Development of Russian Marxism, its application; struggle against liberal-Narodnik trend, exposure before the working class of its bourgeois and petty-bourgeois character.

δ) Organisation of the proletariat. Host of flaws. Insistent demands.

ε) "A lot of people and a shortage of men." Leaders must prepare the masses for an *uprising*.

Written in the spring of 1903

First published in 1939 in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia* No. 1

Printed from the original

THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.[40]

JULY 17 (30)-AUGUST 10 (23), 1903

1

PROGRAMME OF THE R.S.D.L.P. REGULAR SECOND CONGRESS[41]

A. Standing orders of the Congress and its constitution.
B. List and *priority* of questions to be discussed and decided at the Congress.

A. Standing Orders of the Congress.

1. The comrade duly authorised by the Organising Committee[42] is to open the Congress.

2. The Congress is to elect a chairman, two assistants (and deputies) of the chairman, and 9 secretaries. These 9* constitute the bureau and have their seats at the same table.

Organising Committee's report.

3. Election of a committee to verify delegates' credentials and examine any applications, complaints and protests relating to the constitution of the Congress.

(This committee is also to receive the Organising Committee's statement concerning the persons, *as listed*, whom it has invited to attend the Congress with voice but no vote.)**

4. Decision on admitting the Polish Social-Democrats.[43]
to 3***

In brackets are *desirable* addenda, explanations, advice and other remarks of a *particular* character.

---

* Apparently, a slip of the pen: the total should be 12.—*Ed.*
** The bracketed text is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*
*** Point 4, like point 11 in Section B (List and Priority of Questions) was inserted by Lenin additionally. Because of this and changes in

5. Order of the Congress sittings: twice a day from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 7 p.m. (roughly).

6. Limitation on delegates' speeches: rapporteurs not more than 30 minutes per speech; the rest, not more than 10 minutes. No one is entitled to speak more than twice on any question. On points of order, not more than two speakers for and two against every proposal.

7. The minutes of the Congress are to be kept by the secretaries with the participation of the chairman or one of his assistants. Each sitting of the Congress is to start with the approval of the minutes of the preceding sitting. *Every speaker is to submit to the bureau of the Congress a summary of each of his speeches within two hours after the sitting.*

8. The voting on all the questions except the election of functionaries is to be by a show of hands On the demand of ten votes; roll-call votes are to be taken with a record of all votes cast entered in the minutes.

(To accelerate roll-call voting and avoid mistakes, the bureau of the Congress should give ballot papers on each question to every member of the Congress with the right of vote. On each ballot paper, the delegate writes his name (see §8*)

---

the arrangement of the points, Lenin altered their numeration. We give here his final variant.

Lenin subsequently crossed out point 4 and wrote after it: "to 3"—*Ed.*

* According to initial numeration (actually §9).—*Ed.*

and his vote (yes, no, abstain) and also the question to which his vote applies. The questions may be designated by abbreviations or even by a figure, letter, etc. The bureau of the Congress keeps these ballot papers separately for each question until the end of the Congress.)*

9. Secret designation of each delegate's name (or without name: first and second delegate from such and such a Party organisation, etc.).*

10. The chairman's statement that the Congress has been finally constituted as the Regular Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party and that, *consequently*, the decisions of this Congress shall invalidate all earlier contradictory decisions adopted by the Regular First[45] and sectional congresses—that, *consequently*, the decisions of this Congress shall be *absolutely* binding on all the Russian S.D.L. Party.

(It is *undesirable* to touch upon the question of the Bund[44] in connection with this point: it is better *directly* to put it first in the list of questions before the Congress.)

11. Discussion of list and priority of questions.

B. List and Priority of Questions.

1. *The Bund's status in the Russian S.D.L.P.* (Does the Russian S.D.L.P. accept the federal principle of

(It is *necessary* to write a *draft resolution* on this question beforehand, and it is desirable to put it through.)

* The text in brackets is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

Party organisation put forward by the Bund?)*

NB: The reasons why this question is brought up into first place: formal (the Bund's statements, the *composition* of the Congress, subordination to majority), and moral (complete elimination of split and confusion on basic issue).

2. *Approval of the text of programme* of the Russian S.D.L.P.

First reading: adoption *as a whole* of one of the available drafts *as a basis* for detailed discussion.

Second reading: adoption of each point and clause of the programme.

(α. How many draft programmes shall be deemed subject to examination by the Congress? [*Iskra*'s, *Borba*'s,[46] *Zhizn*'s[47]?]

(β. Shall all the drafts be examined or one taken as a basis? Or otherwise: shall one of the proposed drafts be adopted *in the first reading*?)

(Necessity of having this question as a separate item: *end the struggle of trends within Social-Democracy*.)*

3. *Creation of the Party's Central Organ* (newspaper) *or confirmation of one.*

α) Does the Congress want to set up a new organ?

β) If it does not, which of the existing organs does the Congress want to *transform* into the Party's Central Organ?

4. *Reports by the committees* (including the report by the Organising Committee through one of its members) *and other Party*

α) How many reports are there?

β) *Are all the reports to be read* or referred to the committee?

* The text in brackets is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

organisations and individual members.*

γ) Are all the reports to be discussed separately or together?
(better separately)
δ) Order of reading the reports.

5. *Party organisation*. Approval of general organisational Rules of the Russian S.D.L.P.
First reading: selection of one of the drafts as a whole. Second reading: discussion of one of the drafts point by point.**

6. *Regional and national organisations*.
(Recognition or non-recognition of each of them separately in a specified composition and with (perhaps) such and such exemptions from the Party's general Rules.)***

7. *Separate groups in the Party*.
{ *Borba* / *Zhizn* / *Volya*[48] } { *Emancipation of Labour group*[49] } { *Iskra*'s organisation in *Russia*[50] / *Yuzhny Rabochy*[51], etc.**** } *It is necessary* to have a draft resolution on each separate group and separate organisation.*****

Final (or preliminary, that is, with the Central Committee authorised to make the

* Point 4 is crossed out. "Delegates' reports" is written on top in an unknown hand.—*Ed.*
** The text from the word "Approval" to the words "point by point" is crossed out.—*Ed.*
*** The text in brackets is crossed out.—*Ed.*
**** The text from the word "*Borba*" to the word "etc." is crossed out.—*Ed.*
***** The paragraph is crossed out.—*Ed.*

necessary inquiries and lay down the final decision*) *approval of the list of all Party committees, organisations, groups, etc.*	
8. *National question.*	It is necessary to have a resolution on the national question in general (explanation of "self-determination" and *tactical* conclusions from our explanation). (Perhaps also a special resolution against the P.P.S.?[52])
9. *Economic struggle and the trade union movement.*	(*It is necessary* to have a resolution both on the principles and on the pressing tasks facing the Party.)
10. *Celebration of May Day.*	*Ditto.*
11. *International Socialist Congress in Amsterdam in 1904.*[53]	*D i t t o.*
12. *Demonstrations and uprising.*	*D i t t o.*
13. *Terrorism.*	*D i t t o.*
21. *Attitude of the Russian S.D.L.P. to the Socialist-Revolutionaries.* [and to the revolutionary socialists?? etc.?]	*D i t t o.* } insert these two questions after No. 7.***
22. *Attitude of the Russian S.D.L.P. to Russian liberal trends.***	*D i t t o.* }

* The text from the words "that is" to the word "decision" is crossed out.—*Ed.*

** Written in an unknown hand beside this point: "23. Attitude of the R.S.D.L.P. to other revolutionary and opposition parties and trends existing in Russia". Written in Lenin's hand before the number of the point: "23".—*Ed.*

*** The text is crossed out.—*Ed.*

14. *Internal questions of Party work: organisation of propaganda.*
15. " " *agitation*
16. " " **Party** *literature.*
17. " " *work among the peasantry.*
18. " " " *in the army.*
19. " " " *among* **students.**
20. " " " *among* **sectarians.**

} *Resolutions* desirable.

24. *Elections to the Central Committee and the Editorial Board of the Party C.O.*

The Congress is to elect *three* persons to the Editorial Board of the Central Organ and *three* to the Central Committee. These 6 persons *together* shall, if necessary, co-opt by a two-thirds majority additional members to the Editorial Board of the Central Organ and the Central Committee and duly report to the Congress. Following the approval of this report by the Congress, subsequent co-aptation is to be carried out separately by the Editorial Board of the Central Organ and the Central Committee.

[24. *Election of the Party Council.*[54]]

25. *The order governing the publication of decisions and minutes of the Congress and also the order governing the entry upon the exercise of their duties by elected functionaries and institutions.*

Written in the second half of June and the first half of July 1903

First published in 1927 in *Lenin Miscellany VI*

Printed from the original

2

SPEECHES DURING THE EXAMINATION OF THE LIST OF QUESTIONS SUBJECT TO DEBATE AT THE CONGRESS[55]

JULY 17 (30)

1

In the plan, the question of the programme is in the second place. The national question is a part of the programme and is to be dealt with when the latter is discussed. The question of regional and national organisations in general is an organisational one. But the question of attitude to the nationalities, in particular, is a tactical question and is an application of our general principles to practical activity.

2

The first item of the list relates specially to the Bund organisation. The sixth relates to the Party organisation. Upon the establishment of general rules for local, regional, national and other organisations, this special question is raised: which organisations and on what terms shall be recruited to the Party?

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov (The Regular Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. Full Text of the Minutes), Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

3

SPEECH ON THE ACTIONS OF THE ORGANISING COMMITTEE[56]

JULY 18 (31)

The Organising Committee may meet, but not as a collegium exerting an influence on the business of the Congress. The Organising Committee's practical activity does not cease, but there is an end to its influence on the Congress apart from the commission.

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

4

SPEECH ON THE ATTENDANCE OF THE POLISH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS AT THE CONGRESS[57]

JULY 18 (31)

I do not see any weighty arguments against an invitation. The Organising Committee has taken the first step in bringing the Polish comrades closer to the Russian. By inviting them to our Congress we shall take a second step in the same direction. I do not see this producing any complications.

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

5

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE GENERAL SECTION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME

JULY 29 (AUGUST 11)

This insertion makes it worse.[58] It creates the impression that consciousness grows spontaneously. Yet, there is no conscious activity of workers in international Social-Democracy outside the Social-Democrats' sphere of influence.

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

6

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE GENERAL POLITICAL DEMANDS OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME

JULY 30 (AUGUST 12)

1

L e n i n finds Strakhov's amendment unsatisfactory, because the committee's formulation specifically emphasises the *people's will*.[59]

2

L e n i n opposes the word "regional", because it is very vague and may be interpreted in the sense that the Social-Democrats want the whole state split up into small regions.[60]

3

L e n i n finds the addition of the words "and to every foreigner" superfluous, because it is implicit that the Social-Democratic Party will insist that the paragraph in question shall apply to foreigners as well.[61]

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

7

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE GENERAL POLITICAL DEMANDS OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME

JULY 31 (AUGUST 13)

The word "militia" does not say anything new and makes for confusion. The words "universal arming of the people" are clear and quite Russian. I find Comrade Lieber's amendment superfluous.[62]

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

8

PROPOSALS ON VARIOUS POINTS OF THE GENERAL POLITICAL DEMANDS OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME[63]

1) Let "and language" stand at the end of §6.
2) Insert new point:
"The right of the population to receive education in the native language, the right of each citizen to use the native language at meetings and in public and state institutions".
3) In §11 delete the sentence about language.

Written between July 30 and August 1 (August 12 and 14), 1903

First published in 1959 in Vol. 7 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

9

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE SECTION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME RELATING TO LABOUR PROTECTION

JULY 31 (AUGUST 13)

1

L e n i n does not object to a 42-hour rest but, addressing Lieber, remarks that the programme speaks of supervision over all industries. An indication of the actual size will merely restrict the sense. When our programme is a bill we shall write in the details.[64]

2

I object to Comrade Lyadov's amendment.[65] His first two amendments are superfluous because in our programme we demand labour protection for *all* the branches of the economy and, consequently, for agriculture as well. As for the third, it applies entirely to the agrarian section and we shall return to it when debating our draft agrarian programme.

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

10

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE AGRARIAN PROGRAMME

AUGUST 1 (14)

1

L e n i n tables this amendment: instead of "*will work for*" insert "*demand above all*".[66] The reports during the debates pointed out that the draft deliberately says "will work for" in order to emphasise that we do not intend to do this now but in the future. I motion this amendment to avoid giving ground for such misunderstandings. By the words "above all" I mean that we have *other* demands, apart from the agrarian programme.

2

I object to Comrade Lyadov's proposal.[67] We are not drafting a law, but are merely giving general indications. There are those among the townsfolk who also belong to the poll-tax paying estates; in addition, there are the small tradesmen in the suburbs and others, and if we were to write all this into our programme we should have to use the idiom of Volume IX of the Code of Laws.

3

I find Martynov's question superfluous.[68] Instead of putting forward general principles we are being forced into particulars. If we were to do so, we should never come to the end of the Congress. The principle is quite definite: every peasant has the right to dispose of his land, whether *belonging to the commune* or *held as private property*. That is nothing but the demand of the peasant's right to dispose of his land. We insist that there should be no special laws for the peasant; we want more than the right of withdrawing from the commune. We are unable just now to decide on all the particulars that may crop up in implementing this. I am against Comrade Lange's addendum; we cannot demand the abolition of all the laws governing tenure. That is going too far.

4

Martynov must be labouring under a misunderstanding. What we want is uniform application of general legislation, the one now accepted in all the bourgeois states, namely, that which is based on the principles of Roman law and which recognises both personal and common property. We should like to regard communal land-holdings as common property.

5

We are engaged in the drafting of addenda to § 4 in respect of the Caucasus. These addenda should be inserted after point a). There are two draft resolutions. If we adopt Comrade Karsky's amendment, the point will lose heavily in concreteness. In the Urals, for instance, there is a host

of survivals; over there, there is a veritable reservation of serfdom. Concerning the Latvians we could say that they fit the formula: "and in other regions of the state". I support Comrade Kostrov's proposal, namely: we must insert a demand for the transfer of land titles to the khizani, the temporarily bound and others.[69]

6

Paragraph 5 is connected with paragraph 16 of the labour programme: this does imply courts consisting equally of workers and employers; we must demand special representation for the farm labourers and the poor peasantry.[70]

7

I believe this to be unnecessary, since it would extend the competence of the courts out of all proportion.[71] Our aim is to secure a reduction of rents, but the establishment of tariffs would enable the landowners to argue their case by referring to definite facts. The reduction of rent-prices rules out any idea of their increase. Kautsky, speaking of Ireland, said that some results were obtained there by the introduction of industrial courts.

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

11

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE PARTY RULES

AUGUST 2 (15)

L e n i n insists on the inclusion of the words about material support, since everyone accepts that the Party must exist on the funds of its members. On the question of setting up a political party, there should be no references to moral considerations.

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

12

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE PARTY RULES

AUGUST 4 (17)

1

L e n i n finds the first formulation unsuitable because it lends the Council an arbitral character.[72] The Council, however, must be not only an arbitral institution, but also one co-ordinating the activity of the C.C. and the Central Organ. He also speaks out in favour of the Congress appointing a fifth member. It may well happen that the four members of the Council will be unable to elect a fifth; we shall then find ourselves without a necessary institution.

2

L e n i n finds Comrade Zasulich's arguments unsatisfactory.[73] The case she described already implies struggle; in that case the Rules will be of no help. By leaving the election of the fifth member to the four members of the Council, we introduce struggle into the Rules. He considers it necessary to note that the Council is more than a reconciliation body. Thus, for instance, under the Rules, two members of the Council have the right to convene it.

3

L e n i n favours the retention of this phrase; no one should be barred from taking his appeal to the centre. That is a necessary condition of centralisation.[74]

4[75]

There are two questions here. The first is about the qualified majority, and I object to the proposal to reduce it from four-fifths down to two-thirds. Introduction of a motivated protest would show lack of foresight and I object to it.[76] The second question is immensely more important—the right of mutual control over co-optation by the C.C. and the Central Organ. The mutual accord of the two centres is a necessary condition of harmony. This is a question of a break between the two centres. Those who do not want a split must see to it that there is harmony. We know from the life of the Party

that there have been people who introduced splits. This is a question of principle; it is an important question and the whole of the Party's future may depend on it.

5

The Rules may have been lame in one leg, now Comrade Yegorov makes them lame in both.[77] The Council is to co-opt only in exceptional cases. Complete confidence is necessary for both sides, for both centres, just because this is a complex mechanism. There can be no successful work together without full mutual trust. And the entire question of correct functioning together is closely bound up with the right of co-optation. Comrade Deutsch is wrong in exaggerating the technical difficulties.

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

13

ADDENDUM TO PARAGRAPH 12 OF THE DRAFT PARTY RULES

The Central Committee and the Editorial Board of the Central Organ shall co-opt members only with the consent of all the members of the Party Council.

Motioned on August 5 (18)

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

14

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE PARTY RULES

AUGUST 5 (18)

1

Let me reply briefly to both objections.[78] Comrade Martov says that I propose the unanimity of the two collegiums in co-opting members; that is not right. The Congress has decided not to give the right of veto to each member of two, possibly rather extensive, collegiums, but that does not

mean that we cannot vest this authority in the institution co-ordinating all the joint work of the two centres. The joint work of the two centres demands complete unanimity and even personal unity, and that is possible only if co-optation is unanimous. After all, if two members find co-optation necessary, they are entitled to convene the Council.

2

Martov's amendment contradicts the already adopted point on the unanimous co-optation to the C.C. and the C.O.[79]

3

Comrade Martov's interpretation is wrong, because the exemption contradicts unanimity.[80] I appeal to the Congress and request it to decide whether Comrade Martov's amendment should be put to the vote.

4

I should not argue with Comrades Glebov and Deutsch in substance, but I considered it necessary to mention the League[81] in the Rules, first, because everyone knew of the League's existence, second, to make note of the League's representation in the Party under the old rules, and third, because all other organisations have the status of committees, whereas the League is introduced to bring out its special status.[82]

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

15

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE STATEMENT BY MARTYNOV AND AKIMOV[83]

Recognising the statement made by Comrades Martynov and Akimov as contradicting our concept of members of the Congress and even members of the Party, the Congress invites Comrades Akimov and Martynov either to withdraw their statement or to make a definite statement of their

withdrawal from the Party. As for the minutes, the Congress in any case offers them the opportunity to attend the special sitting to approve the minutes.

Written on August 5 (18), 1903
First published in 1927 in *Lenin Miscellany VI*
Printed from the original

16

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE STATEMENT BY MARTYNOV AND AKIMOV

AUGUST 5 (18)

1

The bureau has discussed the statement by Comrades Martynov and Akimov which they filed at the morning sitting. I shall not go into the motivation, although it is wrong and extremely strange. No one has ever declared the Union[84] closed and Comrades Martynov and Akimov made an incorrect inference from the Congress decision on the League. But even the closure of the Union could not deprive delegates of the right to participate in the work of the Congress. Similarly, the Congress cannot allow any refusal to take part in the voting. A member of the Congress is not free merely to approve the minutes without taking part in the rest of its work. For the time being, the bureau does not propose any resolution and refers this question for debate at the Congress. The statement by Martynov and Akimov is extremely abnormal and contradicts the status of member of the Congress.

2

What an absurd and abnormal situation we now have. On the one hand, we are told that the decisions of the Congress are being accepted, and on the other, there is the intention to withdraw over a decision on the Rules. By arriving here as a delegate of an organisation recognised by the Organising Committee, each one of us has become a member of the Congress. This title is not abolished by the dissolution of an organisation. What are we, the bureau, to do during the voting? We cannot simply omit those who

have left, because the Congress has already approved its constitution. There is one logical conclusion that suggests itself: withdrawal from the ranks of the Party altogether. The minutes may be approved with comrades of the Union being specially invited to attend, although the Congress is entitled to approve its minutes even without them.

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

17

ADDENDUM TO MARTOV'S RESOLUTION ON THE BUND'S WITHDRAWAL FROM THE R.S.D.L.P.

The Congress resolves that all measures be taken to restore the unity of the Jewish and non-Jewish labour movement and to explain to the possibly broadest masses of the Jewish workers the attitude of the Russian Social-Democrats to the national question.

Written on August 5 (18), 1903
First published in 1959 in Vol. 7 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

18

SPEECH DURING THE ELECTION OF THE PARTY'S CENTRAL COMMITTEE

AUGUST 7 (20)

We were reproached for the existence of a compact majority. That is not a bad thing in itself. Since a compact majority[85] has been formed here, the question of whether the elected Central Committee will prove to be capable of functioning has already been weighed. There is no question of chance. There is a full guarantee. The election cannot be postponed. Very little time remains. Comrade Martov's proposal to postpone the election is groundless. I support Comrade Rusov's proposal.[86]

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

19

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION OF POTRESOV (STAROVER) ON THE ATTITUDE TO THE LIBERALS[87]

AUGUST 10 (23)

Starover's resolution will be misconstrued: the student movement and *Osvobozhdeniye*[88] are not the same thing at all. It would be harmful to take the same attitude to both. Struve's name is too well known and the workers also know him. Comrade Starover thinks that a definite directive should be issued; I believe we need to define a principled and tactical attitude.

Vtoroi ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1904

Printed from the text of the book

THE LAW ON COMPENSATION PAYABLE TO WORKERS INJURED IN ACCIDENTS

The recent new law, the substance of which is stated in the title of the article, and the law on shop-stewards, which we analysed in the previous issue,* are rather typical specimens of the two trends in our labour legislation expressive of this or that concession to the spirit of the times. Apart from the aggressive reactionary laws of which we have a great abundance and which manage to pass through all the bureaucratic ordeals with especial rapidity, and which are moreover drawn up with especial thoroughness and applied with especial vigour, all the other laws in Russia relating to the working class may be classified under two heads, depending on their political character. These are either laws which in any way, even by a hair's breadth, extend the workers' independence, initiative and rights, in which case the laws are hedged with hundreds and thousands of exemptions, reservations, circular-letter explanations

* See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 508-15.—*Ed.*

and restrictions, all of which lead—as our draft programme puts it—to the "extension or consolidation of tutelage of the working classes by the police and officials". Such are the laws on shop-stewards, factory inspection in general, etc. Or these are laws expressing a concession which has no bearing on citizens' independence and initiative—in which case the autocratic government comes forward with incomparably greater generosity. And that is how it should be, of course, from the standpoint of the autocracy's general tactics, from the standpoint of police interests, "correctly construed". The policy of the police state has long been called that of the whip and carrot by West-European democrats, who have had all sorts of experience in fighting it. The carrot is the sops to the revolutionary classes, the economic concessions designed to sow discord within these classes, to win over a section of them and make it believe in the bourgeois government's sincerity and friendly attitude to the proletariat. The whip is the police harassment of all those who have no trust in the government and sow mistrust among others; the whip is keeping in check all those who want complete freedom and independence for the working class, for its unions, for its meetings, for its newspapers, and for its political institutions and organs.

The law on shop-stewards gives the workers representation which *could* serve them against the bourgeoisie and the government. Accordingly, the representation is so distorted and restricted as to enable only, or at any rate mainly, spies to benefit from it. Accordingly, in actual fact, what remains of workers' representation, as proclaimed by the law, is the collar, as in the case of Trishka's caftan. And that is needed to collar the ill-starred shop-steward and drag him off to the police station. On the other hand, the law on compensation for workers does not affect their political initiative in any way and, consequently, on that score there can be greater generosity. There it is less dangerous to act the "reformer"—and the need to act is *imperative*, because the growing labour movement is looming in an ever more formidable manner. The bureaucratic machine started its work on a bill on employers' responsibility *twenty years* ago. It took ten years to draw up the bill; finally, it was approved by a special commission and in

1893 it was promulgated and placed before the State Council[89] ... only to be pigeon-holed once again for another ten years! It seemed quite impossible to make haste any slower than that, and the bill would possibly have roamed the ministries and the chancellories for another decade or so had not the onslaught by the working class of Russia shaken up the whole of the autocracy.

Finally, and at long last, the bill, repeatedly worsened in many respects, has become law. For an assessment, let us compare it with the demand in our draft Party programme: in fact its "labour section" should he a guide in our work of agitation and propaganda. Nothing but a comparison of the separate points and demands of our programme with present-day reality and the attempts on the part of the ruling classes to reform it without giving anyone offence, will enable us, on the one hand, to give ourselves and the masses a fuller and more concrete understanding of the meaning and significance of our programme; and on the other, to see the defects of the laws in force; it will also help us to see in practice, from the facts, to what extent any reform is doomed to produce paltry results if the basis of the bourgeois system is retained.

Our draft programme (§7 of the "labour section") demands that the law should establish the *employers*' civil liability in general (for workers' injuries and disease), which means anyone who employs workers, anyone who derives profit from the unpaid labour of others, making use of their labour-power, but not being held liable for the destruction or damage of this *commodity* (labour-power) when in operation. However, the new law relates exclusively to workers and employees "in enterprises of the factory and works, mining and metallurgical industries". Consequently, all agricultural workers, handicraftsmen, builders, artisans and so on and so forth are excluded. This means the exclusion of the vast majority of wage-labourers, who often work in even worse and more dangerous conditions; for example, building and agricultural workers operating machines suffer from injuries as much as, if not more than, factory workers. How is this exemption to be explained? The answer is that outside factories and works the shoe does not yet pinch so badly: so far the labour movement has made a formidable

showing only among the leading sections of the proletariat, and it is only in this sphere that the government has shown "concern" (not for the workers, of course, but for their suppression). But the proletariat, that part of it which participates in the movement, that is, the class-conscious proletariat, does not struggle for the benefit and advantages of some single *section* of the workers, but for the whole class, for all the classes oppressed by the capitalist system. This brings out very well the difference between the reforms which the proletariat seeks, and the reforms which the government hands out as sops.

Furthermore, the new law binds the owners of enterprises to pay compensation to workers only for the loss of capacity for work, "*due to bodily injury* caused by operations in the production of the enterprise or arising in consequence of such operations". Our programme demands the establishment of liability not only for disability caused by accidents, but also by *hazardous working conditions*. Consequently, once again the new law narrows down the employers' liability. Everyone knows that masses of workers are disabled not by accidents alone, not by bodily injury, but by the diseases caused by the hazardous working conditions. Unless the employers are held liable for the workers' disability through disease, no amount of rules or instructions will do any good in the struggle against these hazardous conditions. Indeed let us consider what difference there is in substance between the accident in which a machine cuts off a worker's leg and the case of a worker who is poisoned by phosphorus, lead, dyes, etc. Has not medical science already created a whole department of occupational diseases whose origins have been traced to hazardous working conditions and proved as surely as twice two is four? However the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois government are not guided by logic or common sense, but by gross self-interest: accidents will cost them less than bodily injuries plus disease arising from hazardous conditions. And the whole point, for them, is not to "provide security" for the workers but to pay less.

The new law releases the worker from the onus of proving that the disability has occurred through the fault of the capitalist. That is undoubtedly a step forward from the

past. But—the Russian Government is unable to take a step forward anywhere without a "but"!—but to make up for that, employers may prove not only ill intent on the part of the victim himself, but also "gross carelessness on his (victim's) part, unwarranted by the dispatch of operations". This addition largely paralyses the establishment of *real* liability and—given the packing of our courts by officials, careerists and bourgeois pedants—can paralyse the application of the law altogether. "Gross carelessness" is something quite vague and indefinable. It is entirely up to the officials to decide in what conditions and to what extent gross carelessness is or is not warranted. The capitalists have always regarded and will always regard any "carelessness" on the worker's part as gross and unwarranted, and will always he able to muster ten times more witnesses and "learned counsel" than the workers to prove their point (legal counsel are already being paid annual fees by the factories!). The writing of this whole point on gross carelessness into the law is a crass concession to the manufacturer's profit urge: the workers never get caught in the machine by preference, but always by mishap, but the fact is that *you can't be careful* when working ten or eleven hours a day among badly screened machines, in poorly lit shops, amid the din and roar, with your wits dulled by the work, and with your nerves on edge because of excessive tension. That being so, to deprive a disabled worker of compensation because of gross carelessness to penalise him additionally for permitting the capitalists their unscrupulous exploitation.

These points provide the basic and most important definitions of the new law, fully delineating its essence. We cannot, of course, deal here with all the particulars, but let us look only at the most characteristic ones. The amount of the compensation is determined in proportion to the victim's annual earnings, namely, the pension must not be in excess of two-thirds of his annual earnings (in the event of death or total disability). The annual earnings are determined on the basis of the average daily wage (or the average daily wage of an *unskilled worker*) multiplied by 260. This provision contains another *three* reductions in the size of compensation, *three* endorsements of the

employers' profit urge. First, even if the worker has worked 300 days in the year, his annual earnings are cut down to 260 days—without any grounds, simply because the law commands that they should be cut! Second, even if the worker has been earning more than an unskilled worker, the calculation—involving work, say, at enterprises running part of the year—is still based on the earnings of an unskilled worker. The government would very much like to reduce all workers to the status of unskilled workers—hence the lesson for the class-conscious proletariat, that only the close unity of all workers and all unskilled workers together can create a force capable of overcoming capital's profit urge. Third, the unskilled worker's average daily wage is determined once in three years (sic!) by the offices for factory, mining and metallurgical affairs, without, need we say, any of the workers participating. That is not their business, for who can doubt that the chancellories of the governor and the chief of gendarmes have an excellent knowledge of how the workers live and what they earn.

Let us note, too, that the law binds the owners of enterprises to notify the police immediately only about accidents which fall within the compass of the law. Which are they? They are those involving disability for more than three days. But who can tell *just after* an accident for how many days the worker has been disabled? This rule is ridiculously absurd and in many cases merely provides the manufacturers with a loophole for divesting themselves (and being divested by the courts) of the duty of informing the authorities of every accident. It is true that the law decrees that the victim may demand notification of the police of *all cases* of bodily injury *without exception*, *even where they do not fall under the law*: that is said in so many words in §20, of the "rules on compensation payable to injured workers", and we strongly advise all workers to campaign in every way for the constant application of this paragraph without fail. Let the workers insist that everyone injured should always demand unconditionally, on the strength of §20, that the factory inspector be notified of *every* accident; only then will it be possible to determine to any precise extent the number of accidents occurring and to study their causes. We are sure that the class-conscious

workers will make use of this right, but then great masses will not even be aware that such a right is open to them!

For failure to notify the police of accidents and in general for any failure to observe the rules of the new law the owners of enterprises are subject only to a cash fine of from 25 to 100 rubles. That is, of course, an absolutely negligible fine, which is not at all a dreadful one for the large factories (which employ the vast majority of factory workers). This case makes especially clear the necessity of implementing § 14 of our draft programme, which demands "the establishment of criminal responsibility for employers for breaches of labour protection laws". It is a mockery of the worker to threaten millionaires with 100-ruble fines for non-observance of a law on which depends the security of a worker disabled for life.

Par. 31, which entitles injured workers and their families to enter into agreement with the owners of enterprises concerning the type and amount of compensation payable to them, is one of the most pernicious and Jesuitical points of the new law. Need we say that the vast majority of these agreements will amount to systematic fraud and intimidation of the least developed workers who are sure of only one thing, namely, that Russian courts are biased, bureaucratic and expensive. Factory inspectors, who are to witness these agreements (equivalent to settlements out of court), will safeguard anyone's interests but those of the workers.

The factory inspectors, who are now being increasingly turned into mere assistants of the police, play the part of "reconcilers". What is more, it is the intention of the law to turn them into a peculiar category of magistrates. The law encourages employers and workers to apply to factory inspectors in clearing up the rights and duties of the parties, with the factory inspectors being empowered both to collect "all the necessary information" and to demand its submission to the parties, and to invite doctors for certification. This is already purely judicial business and it is assigned to officials under the governor! What is more, no procedure, no rules governing this court have been laid down: how the inspector is to collect the information, how he is—and is he at all—to submit this information to both parties, how he is to conduct the examination—all that is left entirely

up to him. This is something positively like the police courts of the pre-Reform period. The law even holds out the threat of a deprivation for failure to apply to the factory constable (in his capacity as magistrate): those who fail to apply to the factory inspector before going to court, lose their right to receive court and legal costs from the defendant.

It remains for us only to give another reminder at this point that the Social-Democratic Labour Party does not demand courts of that kind, not mediation by officials, but the establishment of industrial courts on which employers and workers are equally represented. That is the only kind of court, given a free political system in the state, that can assure the workers of anything like satisfactory mediation in the business of elucidating the rights and duties of the parties, and in the preliminary examination of claims involving disability compensation. There are such courts in all civilised states, and *as long as 40 years ago* even Russian officials used to propose their introduction in Russia. Forty years ago, a commission was appointed to revise the factory and handicraft regulations. The commission has published its "transactions", five volumes of them; the commission has written the drafts of new regulations; the commission has come out in favour of setting up industrial courts consisting of elected representatives—and... and the whole thing has been shelved! Heaps of good intentions are stacked up in the archives of innumerable offices in Russia, and will continue to be there until the working class gives all this rubbish a shake-up.

Iskra No. 47, September 1, 1903

Printed from the *Iskra* text

TO THE MINUTES COMMITTEE OF THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.

Comrades! In reply to your inquiry as to whether or not we are willing to have our names published in the minutes of the Second Congress we inform you that, for our part, we have absolutely no objection to it, but cannot undertake to decide to what extent this is permissible for reasons of

security in the interests of our comrades in Russia. It is up to the competent Party body to decide on this question of secrecy.

Geneva, October 4, 1903

N. Lenin
G. Plekhanov

First published in 1927 in *Lenin Miscellany VI*

Printed from the original

TO THE MINUTES COMMITTEE OF THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.

The C.C. requests the committee for publishing the minutes of the Congress to let it have immediately the full text as adopted by the Congress of 1) the Party Programme; 2) the organisational Rules of the Party, and 3) all the resolutions and decisions of the Congress.

Written on September 23 (October 6), 1903

First published in 1959 in Vol. 8 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE LEAGUE OF RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY ABROAD[90]

OCTOBER 13-18 (26-31), 1903

1

REMARKS ON THE AGENDA

OCTOBER 13 (26)

1

There is no point in limiting the deliberations on the Rules beforehand. This is to be a new set of rules and, consequently, the words "working out the Rules" may be left in.[91]

2

I need more than an hour for my report. I can, of course, fold it up, but I believe that that is not in the interests of the assembly. I request the chairman to ask the Congress for its opinion. Will it give me more time or must I cut down my report?

3

The League has elected two delegates. Comrade Martov has resigned, and I am now the only authorised delegate. Since there is no longer any time limitation on speeches, I do not understand the meaning of Martov's proposal.[92] There are many here who attended the Congress, and I think we may have not one co-report, but a whole series of them.

Protokoly vtorogo ocherednogo syezda Zagranichnoi ligi russkoi revolutsionnoi sotsial-demokratii, (Minutes of the Regular Second Congress of the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad), Geneva, 1903

Printed from the text of the minutes

2

PREPATORY REMARK TO THE REPORT ON THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.

OCTOBER 13 (26)

I did indeed ask the assembly myself, and no one stopped me. I think that it is quite all right to talk freely about everything. There is a tremendous difference between private conversations and the meetings of the *Iskra* organisation. At any rate, let the meeting express its views. I shall not speak of the private meetings of the *Iskra* organisation until the League finds it necessary for me to do so.

Protokoly vtorogo ocherednogo syezda Zagranichnoi ligi russkoi revolutsionnoi sotsial-demokratii, Geneva, 1903

Printed from the text of the minutes

3

STATEMENT CONCERNING MARTOV'S REPORT

OCTOBER 16 (29)

I declare that now that Martov's so-called co-report yesterday has given an undignified turn to the debate, I consider it unnecessary and impossible to take part in any debates on this point of the Tagesordnung* and, consequently, also waive my summing-up speech, especially in view of the fact that if Martov has the courage to make definite and open charges, he must do so before the whole Party in a pamphlet which in my formal challenge yesterday I suggested he should write.[93]

Protokoly vtorogo ocherednogo syezda Zagranichnoi ligi russkoi revolutsionnoi sotsial-demokratii, Geneva, 1903

Printed from the text of the minutes

4

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE LEAGUE RULES

OCTOBER 17 (30)

1

There is no need to object at length to these arguments.[94] §6 gives the right to organise and consequently to reorganise as well,[95] and a reorganised League will still be the same League, the only Party organisation abroad.

2

To Comrade Martov's question about whether or not functionaries should be confirmed by the Central Committee, I reply that I see no obstacles to the elected administrative officers being approved by the Central Committee.

Protokoly vtorogo ocherednogo syezda Zagranichnoi ligi russkoi revolutsionnoi sotsial-demokratii, Geneva, 1903

Printed from the text of the minutes

* Agenda.—*Ed.*

5

SPEECH ON THE RESULT OF THE VOTING OF THE RESOLUTIONS ON THE LEAGUE RULES

OCTOBER 17 (30)

...Lenin declares on his own behalf and on behalf of the comrades who voted with him that he regards the rejection of Comrade Konyagin's resolution and the adoption of Comrade Martov's resolution as a crying violation of the Party Rules.[96] ("Which paragraph of the Rules specifically does the vote contradict?") I refuse to answer such questions, because this has been sufficiently well clarified in the course of the debate. ("State the paragraph of the Rules which the resolution we have adopted contradicts.") It is up to the Party's central institutions to interpret the Rules; and that is what they will do.

Protokoly vtorogo ocherednogo syezda Zagranichnoi ligi russkoi revolutsionnoi sotsial-demokratii, Geneva, 1903

Printed from the text of the minutes

DECISION OF THE PARTY COUNCIL

GENEVA. NOVEMBER 1, 1903

Copy

Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party

The Council of the Party consisting of Valentinov, Ilyin, Ru and Vasilyev, who is authorised to represent the vote of Yefimov, the fifth member of the Council, met at Geneva on November 1, 1903, at the request of two members of the Council, Ilyin and Vasilyev, and decided: to recognise the acts of the representative of the Central Committee at the League Congress to be correct,[97] and to authorise him to reorganise the League through the inclusion of new members. Valentinov, Ilyin, Vasilyev, Vasilyev for Yefimov, Ru.

Published in 1904 in the pamphlet *Kommentarii k protokolam vtorogo syezda Zagranichnoi ligi russkoi revolutsionnoi sotsial-demokratii* (Commentary on the Minutes of the Second Congress of the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad), Geneva

Printed from the original verified with the text of the pamphlet

R.S.D.L.P. COUNCIL[98]

JANUARY 15-17 (28-30), 1904

1

REMARK ON A POINT OF ORDER

JANUARY 15 (28)

L e n i n raises a point of order and, when given the floor, motions a discussion of the question of the measures which could help to restore peace in the Party and normal relations between members of the Party who do not see eye to eye.

First published in full in 1929 in *Lenin Miscellany X*

Printed from the minutes (with Lenin's corrections)

2

REMARKS ON THE AGENDA

JANUARY 16 (29)

1

L e n i n insists that his resolution should be put to the vote first[99] and refers to the existing custom giving voting priority to the resolution which was motioned earlier.

2

The right of introducing minority opinions has always been recognised as a part of the order of business. Comrade Martov made an attempt to separate the general from the particular.[100] I quite agree with this, but I merely give a somewhat different wording to his proposal.

First published in full in 1929 in *Lenin Miscellany X*

Printed from the minutes (with Lenin's corrections)

3

SPEECH MOTIONING A DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE IN THE PARTY

JANUARY 16 (29)

L e n i n (*reads out his resolution*): "To establish peace in the Party and normal relations between differing members of the Party there is need for the Party Council to explain which forms of the internal Party struggle are correct and admissible and which are incorrect and inadmissible."

Published in 1904 in the pamphlet N. Shakhov, *Borba za syezd* (Struggle for the Congress), Geneva

Printed from the minutes verified with the original

4

SPEECH CONCERNING THE MINORITY OPINION ENTERED BY THE C.C. REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 17 (30)

A rule has been established in the practice of all congresses in virtue of which those voting have the right to record their minority opinions. Of course, every minority opinion is essentially a kind of criticism. But this circumstance did not, after all, prevent the entry at the Second Congress of a minority opinion issued by the Bund representatives, an opinion which was the sharpest kind of criticism levelled at the decision adopted by the Congress. Our minority opinion gets out the motives for which we opposed Comrade Plekhanov's proposal and in general our attitude to this proposal. It is the more necessary to read out this minority opinion because at the end of it there is a motivated statement to the effect that we withdraw our resolution.

First published in full in 1929 in *Lenin Miscellany X*

Printed from the minutes (with Lenin's corrections)

5

SPEECH IN DEFENCE OF THE MINORITY OPINION OF THE C.C. REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 17 (30)

I resolutely protest against the idea that our minority opinion contained any accusations levelled at the Council. Such an interpretation is entirely wrong and Comrade Martov's attempt is an encroachment on our freedom of expression; his resolution is therefore unwarranted.[101]

First published in full in 1929 in *Lenin Miscellany X*

Printed from the minutes (with Lenin's corrections)

6

REMARK ON THE AGENDA

JANUARY 17 (30)

The representatives of the C.C. would like to move several other small points for discussion, but I request that the question of convening a Party congress should be placed on the order paper beforehand.

First published in full in 1929 in *Lenin Miscellany X*

Printed from the minutes (with Lenin's corrections)

7

DRAFT RESOLUTION MOVED ON JANUARY 17 (30)

The Party Council considers it improper for the representatives of the C.O. Editorial Board to communicate to the Secretary of the C.O. Comrade Vasilyev's opinion of him, because this opinion was submitted to the members of the Council only, being a part of the meetings within the Party's supreme body.

First published in full in 1929 in *Lenin Miscellany X*

Printed from the minutes (with Lenin's corrections)

ON BEHALF OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY[102]

We whole-heartedly welcome the excellent idea of the "Group of Founders" to set up a library and archives of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, and earnestly request all comrades and all those sympathising with this long overdue measure to give every possible assistance to our comrades who have undertaken the effort in organising this complex and important business.

Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.

January 29, 1904

Published in January 1904 together with the appeal by the "Group of Founders" in a separate leaflet "To One and All"

Printed from the text of the leaflet

TO THE RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT[103]

The war is on. The Japanese have already inflicted a series of defeats on the Russian troops, and the tsarist government is now straining every nerve to avenge itself for these defeats. Military districts are being mobilised one after another, and tens of thousands of soldiers are being hastily dispatched to the Far East; desperate efforts are being made abroad to secure another loan, and contractors have been promised bonuses running to thousands of rubles a day for accelerating the works required by the war department. The people's every fibre is put to the greatest strain because the struggle that has been started is no trifling matter; it is a struggle against a 50-million-strong people who are splendidly armed, splendidly prepared for the war, and who are fighting for the conditions which they believe to be urgently necessary for free national development. This is going to be a struggle by a despotic and backward government against a people that is politically free and is rapidly progressing in culture. The war against the sickly Turkey in 1877 and 1878, which exacted such a high

price from the Russian people, was negligible when compared to the war now started.

What in that case is at issue in the life-and-death struggle now being waged by the Russian workers and peasants against the Japanese? The issue is "Yellow Russia", the issue is Manchuria and Korea, the new lands seized by the Russian Government. It had promised all the other powers to preserve the inviolability of China, it had promised to return Manchuria to China not later than October 8, 1903, and it had failed to honour its promise. The tsarist government had so run away with itself in its policy of military adventures and plunder of its neighbours that it found no strength to go back. In "Yellow Russia" it has built fortifications and ports, it has laid a railway line and has concentrated tens of thousands of troops.

But how do the Russian people benefit from these new lands whose acquisition has cost so much blood and sacrifice and is bound to cost even more? For the Russian worker and peasant the war holds out the prospect of fresh calamities, the loss of a host of human lives, the ruin of a mass of families, and more burdens and taxes. The Russian army leadership and the tsarist government believe that the war holds out the promise of military glory. The Russian merchant and the millionaire-industrialist think the war is necessary to secure new marketing outlets for their goods and new ports in an unrestricted ice-free sea for the development of Russian trade. You can't sell much at home to the starving muzhik and the unemployed worker, you must look for marketing outlets in foreign lands! The riches of the Russian bourgeoisie have been created by the impoverishment and the ruin of the Russian workers—and so now, in order to multiply these riches, the workers must shed their blood to give the Russian bourgeoisie a free hand in conquering and enslaving the Chinese and the Korean working man.

This criminal war, which holds in store immense calamities for the working people, has been engendered by the interests of the greedy bourgeoisie, the interests of capital, which is prepared to sell and ruin its own country in its drive for profit. This hazardous gamble involving the blood and property of Russian citizens is the result of the policy

of a despotic government which tramples all human rights and keeps its people in servitude. In response to the wild war-cries, in response to the "patriotic" flag-waving by the flunkeys of the money-bag and the lackeys of the police-whip, the class-conscious Social-Democratic proletariat must come forward and demand with tenfold energy: "Down with the autocracy!", "Let a people's constituent assembly be convened!"

The tsarist government has plunged so deep into this reckless military gamble that it has at stake a great deal too much. Even in the event of success, the war against Japan threatens total exhaustion of the people's forces—with the results of the victory being absolutely negligible, for the other powers will prevent Russia from enjoying the fruits of victory as they prevented Japan from doing so in 1895.[104] In the event of defeat, the war will lead above all to the collapse of the entire government system based on popular ignorance and deprivation, on oppression and violence.

They who sow the wind shall reap the whirlwind!

Long live the fraternal union of the proletarians of all countries fighting for complete liberation from the yoke of international capital! Long live Japanese Social-Democracy protesting against the war! Down with the ignominious and predatory tsarist autocracy!

Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party

Written on February 3 (16), 1904

Published in February 1904 as a separate leaflet

Printed from the text of the leaflet

THREE OUTLINES FOR A REPORT ON THE PARIS COMMUNE[105]

1

In Memory of the Paris Commune

Celebration of the greatest working-class uprising of the 19th century.

Historical outline.

1. *France under Napoleon III.*
Imperialism. (S. 45) — retribution for June 1848. Napoleon III.
— Expropriation of France by a gang of brigands.
α. Bonapartism { the workers not yet capable / the bourgeoisie no longer[106] }
β. Rapid industrial development. Plutocratic orgies. Flourishing of speculation. Corruption.
γ. —*Workers' movement*—
I.A.A.[107] 1862 London exposition[108]
— 1864 foundation

{ Proudhonism[109] / Blanquism[110] } S.10

2. *Dynastic war.* Rescue of a band of adventurers—*chauvinism.*
Left bank of the Rhine. On to Berlin (especially after 1866)[111]

{ July 19, 1870 war declared.
German pronouncements (Wilhelm I): Verteidigungskrieg.* (S. 20 in a speech from the throne: war against Napoleon III, *not* against the French people; idem Aug. 11, 1870 in a manifesto to the French on crossing the border.)

3. *Workers' protest.*

First Address of the General Council of the International {
— French manifesto of July 12, 1870 (S. 16) (and provincial resolutions on July 22, 1870) (S. 16-17) Manifesto of Paris members of the International of July 12.
— German protest (meeting at Chemnitz) (S. 18)
(meeting at Brunswick on July 16, 1870 (S. 18)—Berlin section of the International.
— Address of the *General Council* of the International 1) *July 23, 1870* against the war.

* Defensive war.—*Ed.*

4. *Outcome of war.*
Sedan Sept. 2, 1870. Napoleon III prisoner of war. Debâcle.[112]
Collapse of corrupt regime.
Proclamation of the republic Sept. 4, 1870 by workers in Paris.
Power in the hands of *rascals*, Louis Philippe's Minister of Police *Thiers*, General *Trochu*. *Jules Favre*, *Jules Ferry*, *Ernest Picard*. (power—to the delegates of Paris in the legislative corps)

...“*Government of national defence*”....

> National defence = arming of the workers = revolution. Government of popular betrayal. Defence ... *against the Paris workers*.

5. *Advice of the International.*

Second Address of the General Council (Sept. 9, 1870) (S. 25).

Transformation of the defensive war into an offensive one.
Central Committee of the German Social-Democratic Workers' Party protested against annexation of Alsace-Lorraine.[113] (Arrest of Bracke and others.)
Not to allow oneself to be provoked to “desperate folly”.
Not to be deluded by national memories of 1792.
“*Organise your own class* calmly and resolutely”, use p. liberty.[114]

6. *Siege of Paris*. Comedy of *Trochu* (never!) and *Jules Favre* (not an inch of soil!).[115]
Surrender of Paris. Jan. 28, 1871.

Comedy of defence: Guiod writing to Susane about one of the latter's protégés: let him go to Mont Valérien, he said, where the guns are being allegedly fired off,[116]

7. *National Assembly at Bordeaux*.

Under the terms of the surrender (Jan. 28, 1871)

—Chamber of Junkers. *Reactionaries.*
—Comedy of peace with Paris. *Urge to disarm Paris* ("disarmament of the revolution" Sept. 4, 1870). Alliance with the German army against Paris.

(S. 34), the National Assembly must be convened *within 8 days* (!).
Thiers' agitation for a *reactionary assembly*, Legitimists, etc. (450 monarchists out of 750 members).
Conspiracy against Paris: *Thiers' measures* (S. 35).

The pretence that the guns of the National Guard belong to the state! A lie! S. 36-37.

1) anti-republican demonstration by the National Assembly
2) ambiguity of Thiers' expressions
3) threat to Paris (décapiter décapitaliser*)
4) ban on republican newspapers
5) death sentence for Blanqui
6) appointment of *Vinoy* governor of Paris, *Valentin*, Police Prefect, *D'Aurelle de Paladines*, commander of the National Guard.

8. *Attempt to take away the guns. March 18*, **1871.** (from the National Guard). { Vinoy / Failure }
Commune.
March 18. Government's night to Versailles.

Manifesto of March 18: S.43.
March 18, 1871. *Central Committee* of the National Guard.
March 26, 1871. Commune.

(Clericals, Bonapartists, gendarmes.)

* Decapitate and decapitalise.—*Ed.*

It was not the Commune but the indignant soldiers who shot Lecomte and Clément Thomas, the Bonapartist officers.

Paris waging war against Versailles from early April.
Begging Bismarck for troops (prisoners of war) (S. 57-58).

9. *The Commune's deeds.*
Its *minuses*: — *lack of class consciousness* (Proudhonists, Blanquists)
— **lack of organisation** (failure to take the bank and attack Versailles)
— *infatuation with nationalistic and revolutionary talk.*

10. *Its pluses*:
A) *Political reforms*
α. separation of church from state (Apr. 2, 1871). Expropriation of church properties. Abolition of all state payments to the church.
Free public education (S. 46)
β. abolition of standing army (March 30, 1871) (S. 46)
Working-class government
γ. abolition of bureaucracy. *Government of the workers* (S. 49). Regierungsfähig.*
(1) All officials elective and removable (S. 46). Apr. 1, 1871
(2) Small salary, to be not over 6,000 francs (S. 46)

managed to do with a quarter of the officials: Lissagaray, S.

δ. Equal rights for aliens (March 30, 1871), a German—minister of the Commune[117] (S. 53). *Participation of Poles* (Dabrowski, Wróblewski).

The banner of the Commune is the banner of a world republic

ε. Self-government of communes.

* Capable of governing.—*Ed.*

11. B) *Economic reforms.*

Transformation of the Paris of idlers and pleasure-seekers into a working-class Paris (S. 55-56).

- —Bakers' night work banned (Apr. 20) (S. 53).
- —Fines banned (S. 53).
- —The Commune won over a mass of Paris petty bourgeois *ruined* (elaborate) by Napoleon III (debts deferred) (S. 51). *The Commune addresses* **the peasants** (S. 51).
- —Transfer of abandoned factories to workers' associations Apr. 16 (S. 54): statistical *census* of factories.

12. *Last fight.*

—Heroism of the Federals (Election of mayors on Apr. 30 against the National Assembly. Thiers gives in to Bismarck: peace treaty signed at Frankfort on May 10. Approved by the National Assembly on May 21.)

—Week of bloodshed May 21-28, 1871 (S. 62). Rifles not enough machine-guns.

—Balance 35,000 —— 20,000 killed
15,000 transported, etc.
(*Courts* busy for several years.)

Chorus of slander (S. 64-66).

13. *Results and lessons.* Revenge by the bourgeoisie. *Even the "national war" turned out to be a political fraud* (S. 67). Country betrayed (alliance with the Germans: S. 66).
Instability of bourgeois democracy. *Dictatorship of the proletariat.*
Bismarck 1871. Confer *1904*.

Written before March 9 (22), 1904

First published in 1934 in *Lenin Miscellany XXVI*

Printed from the original

2

1. France under Napoleon III. Government of Bonapartists.
   Industrial development.
   Working-class movement— { Proudhonism and Blanquism }
   I. A. A.
2. Dynastic war. (July 19, 1870)
   Chauvinism
   On to Berlin.
   Left bank of the Rhine.—
   NB (German statements: *Verteidigungskrieg*.)
3. Workers' protest (working-class attitude)
   —French manifesto (Resolutions)
   —German protest
   —*Address* of the General Council of the International—*warning to workers*: organise, *watch out for provocations*.
   NB
4. Course and outcome of war.
   —Collapse of corrupt regime.
   —Siege of Paris.
   —*Proclamation of the republic on Sept. 4, 1870*. French workers—their cause—utilised by the bourgeoisie *Government of "national defence"*.
   (Rascals in its midst.)
5. Defence of Paris. *Comedy* of Jules Favre (Trochu). —its surrender.
6. Attempt to disarm the proletariat. March 18, 1871. *The Commune*.
7. *Versailles government*. Chamber of Junkers, landowners (Ruraux, Krautjunker).
   —comedy of "peace" with Paris
   —bargaining with Bismarck
   —alliance with the German army against the proletariat.

8. *The Commune*.... Its minuses—lack of class consciousness (Proudhonism and Blanquism)
—lack of organisation { failure to take the bank and to attack Versailles }
—interlacing of nationalistic elements

9. +A) *Political freedom*
—*separation of church from state*
—abolition of standing army
—abolition of bureaucracy
—equal rights for aliens. Participation of Poles
—self-government of communes (*the Commune*).

10. B) *Economic reforms*
—bakers' night work banned
—fines banned
—debts deferred
—idle factories handed over to workers
—binding character (maintenance, etc.) of *any* cohabitation with a woman
—payment (pensions?) to *all* widows.

11. *Last fight*:
Heroism of the Federals.
Week of bloodshed.
Balance: *35,000*.
Terrorism.

12. *Results and lessons*:
Revenge by the bourgeoisie.
Challenge to battle.
Bismarck 1871 and 1904.

Written before March 9 (22), 1904

First published in 1934 in *Lenin Miscellany XXVI*

Printed from the original

3

I. 1. Napoleon III and his band.
2. Shame of France.
3. *Bourgeoisie*'s guilt in Napoleon III.

II. 1. Dynastic war against Germany.
2. French workers' protest (Paris, July 12, and Manifesto of the International, July 23).
3. Wilhelm I's solemn promise (Aug. 11). His deception.
4. German workers' protest (Sept. 5, 1870) and their arrest.

III. 1. Republic Sept. 4, 1870. Won by Paris workers.
2. Seizure of power by *swindlers* (Favre, Trochu, Thiers—ticket-of-leave men[118]).
3. "Government of popular defence"=government of popular betrayal. Fight against French *w o r k e r s.*

IV. Marx's warning (Manifesto of the International Sept. 9, 1870).
Dupont's letters.[119]

V. 1. Slave-owners' and monarchists' plot to disarm Paris.
2. Bordeaux and the transfer of the National Assembly to *Versailles*.
3. Dispatch of Vinoy, Valentin and de Paladines to Paris.
4. Monarchist speeches in the Assembly of "Rurals".

VI. Start of civil war by Thiers: guns taken away March 18, 1871 (Lecomte and Clément Thomas killed).

VII. March 18, 1871. *The Commune.*
1. Republic + self-government.
2. *T h e C o m m u n e*'s *m e a s u r e s.*
3. {{Its two mistakes}} (Failure to attack Versailles / " to take the bank)

VIII. War against the Commune: begging Bismarck for soldiers, ignominious peace. Week of bloodshed May 21-28, 1871.

35,000 killed [20,000] *according to* bourgeois newspaper *estimates.*

13,450 (including 157 women)[120] sentenced by the courts (! after March 18 the courts were busy for another *5½ years*!).

Written before March 9 (22), 1904

First published on March 13, 1926 in *Pravda* No. 63

Printed from the original

R.S.D.L.P. COUNCIL[121]

MAY 31 AND JUNE 5 (JUNE 13 AND 18), 1904

1

REMARK ON THE AGENDA

MAY 31 (JUNE 13)

Lenin motions the addition to the list of items on the agenda of the question raised by the Polish Socialist Party (P.P.S.) concerning the desirability of calling a conference of R.S.D.L.P. and P.P.S. representatives to discuss the basis and terms of joint struggle by the two parties.

First published in full in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XV*

Printed from the minutes

2

SPEECHES ON AN INTER-PARTY CONFERENCE[122]

MAY 31 (JUNE 13)

1

I second the proposal to invite both Latvian organisations.[123] As for the Armenian federalist organisation,[124] there can be no question of inviting it to the conference after what Comrade Martov has said about its intimacy with the Socialist-Revolutionaries. Furthermore, I don't quite see the point of Comrade Plekhanov's insistent proposal of the need for an immediate reply to the Finns.

2

I think it would be too much to demand unanimity in decisions on questions of principle.[125] I can't see any of the Social-Democrats staying on if the conference adopted some monstrous decision.

First published in full in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XV*

Printed from the minutes

3

SPEECHES ON R.S.D.L.P. REPRESENTATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS

MAY 31 (JUNE 13)

1

I should like to have an explanation as to whether it is convenient to send delegates both from the Council and from the individual organisations. Are there any similar examples in the practice of other countries at earlier congresses? I think this mode of representation is somewhat inconvenient in terms of both principle and practice (from the financial, technical and other standpoints). Would it not be better for the Council to be represented there in corpore? I don't see how we could be victimised. After all, our Party can't be deprived of its vote!

2

Since Comrade Plekhanov says that we shall not be able to secure the Party's separate representation at the Congress, while the dispatch of a large number of delegates to the Congress would cost a great deal, and anyhow we shall not be able to match the Bundists in this respect, it would be more dignified if the Council alone represented the Party at the Congress.

3

Moreover, we shall hardly have time to contact all the organisations to obtain their mandates.[126] In view of this, I motion that in case of necessity the Council should, without contacting the individual organisations, be empowered to represent each of them separately....

First published in full in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XV*

Printed from the minutes

4

REMARK ON THE NEED OF CONTROL OVER THE GNCHAK NEWSPAPER[127]

MAY 31 (JUNE 13)

Lenin seconds Comrade Martov's proposal, remarking that there is need for control over the publication of the Gnchak newspaper, which has not always been Social-Democratic.

First published in full in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XV*

Printed from the minutes

5

MOTION OF AMENDMENT TO MARTOV'S RESOLUTION ON THE RIGHT OF THE C.O. AND THE C.C. TO RECALL THEIR REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE PARTY COUNCIL

JUNE 5 (18)

Comrade Martov remarked that he put forward his proposal regardless of the concrete cases and merely to avoid conflicts in the future. That is why I shall not refer to any concrete cases either and if the resolution is designed exclusively to lay down a definite rule for the future, I shall not argue against it. Perhaps it would be better to cut it down and reduce it to the right of the collegium to recall its representatives, deleting the sentence on non-responsibility to the Congress.

First published in full in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XV*

Printed from the minutes

6

SPEECH ON CO-OPTATION TO THE COMMITTEES AND ON THE C.C.'S RIGHT TO APPOINT NEW MEMBERS

JUNE 5 (18)

What Martov said was news to me.[128] We have quite definite indications that the minority of the Moscow Committee proposed the co-optation of one of its candidates, without, however, connecting this question with factional

differences. Furthermore, speaking on the substance of the matter, I would consider it more correct and more in the spirit of the Rules to regard every fraction as a unit; nevertheless, this question is so insignificant that I agree to vote for Comrade Martov's resolution.

First published in full in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XV*

Printed from the minutes

7

SPEECHES ON THE VOTING PROCEDURE IN DECIDING THE QUESTION OF CONVENING THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.

JUNE 5 (18)

1

L e n i n joins Glebov in regarding the votes of the Tver and the Riga committees as invalid,[129] and proposes that the organisations should be regarded as existing not since the issue of their proclamations but since their confirmation by the C.C. In addition, he says, the reference to the date of the Congress should be deleted from Martov's resolution. The rules of the leagues will determine how many votes they are to have at the Congress. Until their rules are approved, everything should remain as it was at the Second Congress. For example, the Caucasian League[130] should have six votes.

2

Comrade Martov and I essentially agree on the right of 9 committees in voting on the Congress. The Baku Committee, I believe, should not have a separate vote because it is a part of the Caucasian League. Inquiries should be made about all the five leagues and then the relevant decisions adopted.

3

In substance I would have nothing against Comrade Martov's proposal, but it would be formally wrong.[131] The Congress has not confirmed them and, consequently, they should be subject to the rule that they may vote for or

against the Congress only after one year. There is the less reason to discuss this, since the period has almost run out. But we should be very careful about the Caucasian League: they would be deeply mortified if we gave them only two votes instead of the six they had. Moreover, I think that Comrade Martov tends to confuse two points (*e* and *f*) of § 3 of the Rules, when he proposes that leagues should be given the same status as committees. Thus, I motion that we postpone the question of the Caucasian League and make inquiries through the C.C.

4

I join in Comrade Martov's opinion concerning the Caucasian League.[132] Then there is another juridical question of how the votes of the Council are to be counted in a general count of the votes required for the convocation of a congress. I think two interpretations would be correct: either, in determining the required number of organisations, to make the count without including the five votes of the Council in the overall total of votes belonging to all the organisations, and then to count each vote of the Council separately; or simply to take one-half of the existing number of organisations, without the Council, and to reckon this half as the number required in this case. I believe that it would be most correct to count each of the Council's votes separately.

First published in full in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XV*

Printed from the minutes

8

SPEECHES ON THE QUESTION OF PUBLISHING THE MINUTES OF THE PARTY COUNCIL SITTINGS

JUNE 5 (18)

1

I absolutely disagree with Comrade Martov. It is desirable to establish for all the sittings of the Council the rule adopted on the minutes of the last sitting.[133] This publication will hardly be impeded by the requirements of secrecy and it would be highly important for Party members to

know what is going on in the Party's supreme body and the opinions which are held there by both sides.

2

I am very much surprised by Comrade Glebov's raising the question of the decision taken at the last sitting and his proposal to review it now. I believe such a review is inadmissible, either formally or morally.

3

No decision on their publication has yet been taken by the C.C. and I merely insist on the C.C.'s *right* to take such a decision, whenever it deems it necessary to do so.[134]

First published in full in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XV*

Printed from the minutes

STATEMENT ON THE TRANSFER OF THE POWERS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. C.C. REPRESENTATIVES ABROAD

Brunnen, July 28, 1904

In view of my departure from Geneva and in view of Comrade Glebov's sudden departure, I think it is natural that all the business of both C.C. representatives abroad should be handled by a commission of its agents, that is Comrades Olin, Bonch-Bruyevich and Lyadov.

C.C. Representative abroad, *N. Lenin*

First published in 1959 in Vol. 8 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE MAJORITY'S GENEVA GROUP

While by and large subscribing to the Riga Declaration[135] as being a quite correct and principled expression of the views and policy of the Party majority of the Second

Congress, the meeting deems it necessary to take a definite stand on the new step taken by the C.C.

The meeting voices its deep conviction that the C.C. declaration[136] (see *Iskra* No. 72[137]) strikes a major blow for clanishness as against the Party principle, and is another betrayal of the interests of the Party as a whole, a fresh attempt to corrupt the Party by introducing hypocrisy into Party relations. The meeting brands the opposition by an accountable Party organ to the convocation of a Party congress and its statement that any agitation for the congress is harmful as a disgraceful fact not to be found in the records of any dignified workers' party. To receive one's powers at a Party congress from the Party majority and to proclaim this majority's policy to be a group policy; to speak of peace between the two contending sides and to make a behind-the-scenes deal with the self-styled representatives abroad of one of the sides; hypocritically to extol the "lofty" stand of one's opponents of yesterday and to begin reconciliation by dismissing the members and agents of the C.C. who dared commit the crime of agitating for a congress—all this is clear evidence that the new C.C. in its new policy has decided to join the C.O. in treating the Party as a nonentity. The meeting vigorously condemns this policy of Bonapartism, urges all Party members to fight resolutely against usurpation and hypocrisy, and demands the full publication of the Council's minutes and all data on the activity of the central bodies which do not have to be withheld for reasons of secrecy.

The meeting calls on all members of the Party sharing the principled views of the majority to support the publishing house set up by Comrade Bonch-Bruyevich[138] and to agitate vigorously for the convocation of the Third Congress.

Written later than August 25 (September 7), 1904

First published in 1960 in Vol. 9 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

PLANS FOR AN ARTICLE "THE PEASANTRY AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY"[139]

1

The Peasantry and Social-Democracy

Marxist Theory and the Social-Democratic Programme

1. The agrarian question in West-European Social-Democracy. David, etc.
2. " " " in Russia: both the old Narodniks and the liberals and the Socialist-Revolutionaries. Practical importance during reforms.

3. *Large- and small-scale production.*
   Auhagen
   Klawki
   etc. *Conclusions* concerning *maintenance of labourers, cattle and land.*
   Denmark (David).
4. **Co-operatives. David**, etc. French reactionaries:
   Rocquigny
   Goltz
   Buchenberger.
5. Russia's specific features.
   Together with the peasant bourgeoisie against the landowners.
   " " the urban proletariat against the peasant bourgeoisie.
6. The importance of Social-Democratic agitation among the peasants, especially in periods of political revival. Development of class-consciousness, democratic and Social-Democratic thinking among the peasants.

2

1. Marxist theory (α) on the condition, evolution and role of the peasantry—and (β) the Social-Democratic programme. Closely bound up.

2. The urgency of the peasant question. The agrarian programmes of the Social-Democratic parties: the French (petty-bourgeois character. Engels's critique[140]), the German (1895. Breslau, opportunist and revolutionary wings), *Russian*... (Critics. "**David.**"). (Bulgakov)....

3. It is the *Russian* agrarian programme of the Social-Democrats that especially distinguishes them from the *Narodniks* and the *Socialist-Revolutionaries*.

4. The principles of Marxist theory concerning the peasantry (cf. *The Development of Capitalism*,* quotations from Marx). (1) the role of large-scale production; (2) the peasant's petty-bourgeois character; (3) his past (—) and future (+). Add K. Kautsky, *The Social Revolution*.

5. Large- and small-scale production in agriculture....
   Stumpfe. **Souchon**.
   From MS.: *Hecht*, Auhagen, Klawki, Baden, German statistics....

6. Conclusion: the importance of the maintenance of labourers, cattle and land.

7. Add: Huschke, Haggard, Baudrillart, Lecouteux, *Prussian Inquiry*, Bavarian and Hessen inquiries, Hubach.

8. Debt. *Prussian statistics*.

9. Co-operatives. General statement of the question.
   Rocquigny, Goltz, Buchenberger, Haggard.
   Statistical data: *German* and *Russian* (communal lease). *D e n m a r k*.

10. Conclusions concerning the West.

11. Russia's specific features.... On two flanks.
    The peasant bourgeoisie and the rural proletariat.
    Relics of *serfdom*, and the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

---

* See present edition, Vol. 3.—*Ed*.

12. Together with the peasant bourgeoisie against the landowners, etc. } connect with
" " the urban proletariat against the bourgeoisie. } cut-off lands.

13. Practical importance of the agrarian question in the possibly immediate future:
Exposure of class contradictions in the countryside. Democratic and Social-Democratic agitation and propaganda.

Written not earlier than September 1904

First published in 1938 in *Lenin Miscellany XXXII*

Printed from the original

PLAN FOR A PROPAGANDA TALK ON CRISES[141]

1. What is a crisis?—Stoppage in industry, unemployment, hitch in marketing, overproduction.
1. α) What is an industrial crisis?
b) Stoppage of factories, hitch in marketing, bankruptcies, unemployment.
γ) Overproduction....
2. *Overproduction*, **underconsumption***. (Elaborate the contradiction.)
2. α) Overproduction, and underconsumption*.
3. How can that be? (α) Division of contemporary society into two classes, the bourgeoisie and the **proletariat.** (β) Production for the market.
4. Competition, its international character, drive for markets, gigantic growth of production.
5. Reduction in demand for living labour: *intensification*, *machines*, women *and children*, *skilled* and unskilled workers.
5 bis: **Supply grows, marketing tight.**

* These words are in English in the original.—*Ed.*

6. Periodical crises, their regularity, their inevitability under capitalism. (Illusions in time of prosperity.)
8. 7.* *Reserve army.* Calamities of unemployment. *Bondage: right to live only when producing* profit.
(percentage of old beggars): {1/3-1/2} ....
7. 8. The effect of the crisis on the workers and *petty proprietors.*
Ruin, poverty: dawning socialist awareness....
Meeting of unemployed in Britain in 1889.[142]
9. Crisis and capitalism. Crisis and the development of large-scale production—trusts, etc. The tasks of socialism. The socialist revolution: Social-Democratic labour parties.

Examples of large-scale production:
Morozov:
Steam-powered mills:
Iron and steel:

Written in the autumn of 1906

First published in 1959 in the magazine *Voprosy Istorii KPSS* No. 3

Printed from the original

PLAN FOR THREE TALKS ON THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PROGRAMME

α) Contemporary system.
β) Socialist aims and the class struggle.
γ) Struggle against the autocracy.

for 2-3 hours | Divide α-γ into three talks

Plan for first talk

on the Social-Democratic programme

1. The struggle of the workers against their masters to improve their condition is world-wide. Strikes—socialism. What does this mean?

* Point 7 was subsequently changed to point 8 and vice versa.—*Ed.*

α
2. Contemporary society is arranged as follows: it is divided into working people and exploiters. Two classes. Property-owners and proletarians. Who maintains whom?
3. Workers' plight: low wages. Malnutrition. Unemployment. Female labour. Child labour. "Degeneration of the nation." Prostitution. Social and political oppression.

β
4. In large-scale production, workers unite to fight against their masters. Under capitalism, the whole of society is more tightly knit, making possible a transition to socialist production. Example of the masters being quite *useless* in big factories and estates.
5. Socialist revolution=land and factories handed over to the workers. Socialist production, short working hours, etc.
6. Demands on modern society to *facilitate* the workers' struggle and *safeguard* them against degeneration: labour reforms, 8-hour working day, weekly payment of wages, living quarters, medical aid, schools, etc.

γ
7. Political demands. What is an autocracy? Struggle for political freedom. (Constitution—republic, freedom of speech, assembly, etc., etc.)
8. Revolutionary parties and their role in the working-class struggle. Narodnaya Volya and *Social-Democracy*.

Written in the autumn of 1904

First published in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XV*

Printed from the original

NOTE BY THE *VPERYOD* EDITORIAL BOARD TO THE LETTER OF THEIR ST. PETERSBURG CORRESPONDENT[143]

Letter from St. Petersburg (*pp. 1-6**)

From the Editorial Board. The conclusion at which the St. Petersburg correspondent arrives is completely in line

* The pages of the letter.—*Ed.*

with our own in the article: "Time to Call a Halt!" (*Vperyod* No. 1).* The Mensheviks have shown themselves to be completely unwilling to work together, submitting to the majority, and now that the institutions set up by the Second Congress have been disorganised and they have frustrated the convocation of a third congress, the Party has no other means of fighting them except a break. The earlier and more complete this break with the disorganisers, the....**

From the Editorial Board. The conclusion of our St. Petersburg comrade fully bears out the correctness of our own conclusion (*Vperyod* No. 1, "Time to Call a Halt!"). We advise all committees and organisations of the majority to exercise firmness in removing the disorganisers as soon as possible so as to have a chance to work, instead of engaging in squabbles.

Written after December 22, 1904
(January 4, 1905)

First published in 1934
in *Lenin Miscellany XXVI*

Printed from
the original

OUTLINE OF THESES FOR AN ARTICLE "HOW THEY DEFEND THEMSELVES"[144]

How They Defend Themselves

1) Two replies to Lenin's pamphlet on *The Zemstvo Campaign and "Iskra"'s Plan****—the Editorial Board's *and* Plekhanov's. This *and* is also curious (Plekhanov is *nominally* on the Board), but the *distinction* between their replies is extremely interesting.

Plekhanov defends an incorrect stand very cleverly and cautiously. The Editorial Board, not cleverly.

Plekhanov says *nothing* at all about either 1) Starover's resolution and *its* connection with the *Iskra* plan, or 2) the "higher type of mobilisation". Ergo, what Plekhanov passes over in silence is the *e s s e n c e* of *Iskra*'s mistake (Starover's resolution is the beginning of the mistake, its

* See present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 35-39.—*Ed.*
** Here the MS. breaks off. The text is crossed out by Lenin.—*Ed.*
*** See present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 495-516.—*Ed.*

starting-point. The final point—the consideration of the "higher" type).

The Editorial Board *emphasises* the connection of its stand with Starover's resolution, and *comes out for* the idea of the "higher type".

Both the Editorial Board and Plekhanov make a very weak *stand for* the talk on panic (clearly retreating and backtracking).

Plekhanov keeps harping on the contradiction between the old and the new Lenin[145] in an effort to prove that the *Iskra* Editorial Board was acting according to the old Lenin.

Plekhanov tries to create the impression that Lenin is *now* opposed to demonstrations before the Zemstvo men and is against dictating to them a "positive programme of action". This is an absurdity and a distortion.

What were my theses against *Iskra*?

1) The talk of panic is vulgar and irrelevant.

Reply? Plekhanov on the Tambovites (ha-ha!)[146]
" on the anarchists (where?)
Editorial Board's "obstruction"
} The Editorial Board is almost being robbed: "superfluous".

2) "Agreements" with the liberals must be determined by the actual common struggle and not by "promises". *N i l*—Plekhanov.

3) Starover's terms rejected. (The Editorial Board makes a very weak case, with a virtual admission.)

4) "New type." Editorial Board—schwach.* Plekhanov—*n i l*. On the question of *uprising* see *Iskra* No. *62*. Leading.**

"Purely utopian views"
on preparations for an uprising.
"Are beginning to manifest themselves"....

Written between December 28, 1904 and January 11 (January 10 and 24), 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

---

* Bad.—*Ed.*

** This word is in English in the original.—*Ed.*

STATEMENT BY THE GROUP OF FOUNDERS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. LIBRARY AT GENEVA

The group which initiated the establishment of the R.S.D.L.P. library at Geneva has unanimously decided to hand it over to the Majority Committees' Bureau[147] for the general management of the library pending a decision by the Third Party Congress.

Written in late December 1904 and early January 1905

First published in 1934 in *Lenin Miscellany XXVI*

Printed from the original

1905 – 1910

PLAN FOR AN ARTICLE "1895 AND 1905 (SHORT PARALLEL)"[148]

1895 and 1905
(Short Parallel)

There are here eigentlich* two topics: 1) the parallel of growing work; 2) present-day organisational tasks. They should be dealt with in *two* separate articles.

1. Compare the scope, proportions and forms of Social-Democratic work then and now.
2. Scope: only circles then. Scarcely the *first* beginnings of mass agitation. Propaganda very heavy and academic. The Social-Democrats making their way among the Narodnaya Volya movement, the Narodnoye Pravo[149] movement, etc.
3. Today. The Party. Ordinary mass agitation. Open political action in the street. Revolutionary epoch.
4. Forms. 10-16 persons (committee). 20-30 workers' circles. Maximum, 100-150 ties. "Readings." *Self-education*—the crux.
5. Today. The organisation has grown to many "storeys" St. Petersburg and Odessa [committee—districts—organisers' meetings (central circles)—groups, and then "the centre" and the bureau. Something like five new *storeys*].
6. "A Letter to a Comrade"** was written at a time when the new storeys were being put together and the Economists slowed down their growth. The ideas advocated in "A Letter to a Comrade" have now virtually been translated into life.

---

* Strictly speaking.—*Ed.*

** See present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 229-50.—*Ed.*

7. New tasks: γ) Abundance of storeys has brought up a new section of Party workers, Party members. Their participation should be formalised. (1) Information—resolutions—polls—direct ties with the Central Organ. (2) Elective principle? (3) Indication or selection of candidates for co-optation?
8. Another and perhaps even more important task: the work of adding new horizontal storeys should be supplemented by the work of new "vertical", you might say, ways of influence. That is: the growth of the movement makes it necessary and possible to supplement this current work on the storeys by the upper storeys addressing the mass in new forms of massive meetings. "Short meetings" and "mass rallies", as a natural product of work on many "storeys", of themselves lead up to that higher form which prevails abroad and will triumph here le lendemain de la révolution,* namely: to the "mass rallies" as the principal means of political influence on the proletariat and its Social-Democratic education.
9. Of course, this makes the "storeys" *equally* necessary. They will (always?) be necessary. The thing is to "supplement" and not to "substitute"....

Written before January 9 (22), 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

A MILITANT AGREEMENT FOR THE UPRISING AND THE FORMATION OF A COMBAT COMMITTEE

PLAN:[150]

1) Motive behind agreement
2) Its aims
3) Programme (1) overthrow of autocracy
(2) provisional revolutionary government
(3) arming of the people
(4) Constituent Assembly
(5) revolutionary peasant committees.

* The day after the revolution.—*Ed.*

4) Formation of an *interim combat committee* for the purpose of
   (1) collecting money
   (2) clarifying manpower
   (3) informing masses of Russian workers about the agreement and broadly discussing means of implementation
   (4) preparing for a *Russian* conference to form a *Russian* Combat Committee.
5) The task of the Combat Committee: co-ordination of measures in preparing for an uprising.
   2/3 in view of the importance of total solidarity and maintenance of independence by each party.
6) The Combat Committee's attitude to terrorism.
7) Call to all socialists and all revolutionary democrats.

5 bis
The Combat Committee issues an appeal *only* on questions *entirely* within its programme and not otherwise than with a reservation about the Party's independence in every case.

Written in February-March 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

RECORD OF SPEECHES AT THE GENEVA BOLSHEVIK CLUB[151]

MINUTES OF MARCH 5, 1905

I

L e n i n. Proposes that all the results of the section's work should be made public—above all that Stepanov should submit his report in writing, and also the minutes. A general summary of these minutes should be handed over to the Congress; they could provide many practical indications during the work of the Congress. Stepanov's report is regrettably much too abstract in character. If exact conclusions in the form of resolutions are to be made from the reports, they must be more concrete. With that end in view I propose a poll among comrades in Russia

and abroad, specifying that they should give precise answers to the questions stated (yes, no, so many). A picture of their work, e.g., the town in which one worked, the questions one decided at meetings, etc. While the summarised conclusions could yield something, I repeat that no precise conclusions could be drawn from them. That is why I propose that the circle should set about working out a questionnaire to be circulated among comrades in Russia and abroad, for concise replies to all questions. If we have at our disposal raw material of this kind (if 100-200 comrades reply), the Congress could use it for precise conclusions.

I reiterate my proposals: first, a summary of all the minutes and also the minutes themselves should be submitted to the Congress; second, a start should be made on drawing up a questionnaire. This should be done right away, without any delay, and I propose that all work in the section should be dropped in favour or putting the minutes in order and writing a report on them for the Congress.

II

L e n i n. Now that the announcement of the convocation of the Third Congress is out, the work of the sections has taken on a different character. The sections have now been working for two months, but very little has been done, all things considered: the minutes are not all there, and there are no reports; we should make haste with this, so that all these efforts should be of practical importance and not go to waste, i.e., all this should be placed before the Congress. In order to submit the minutes as soon as possible, I propose that the whole circle should set about helping the secretaries. I repeat that unless the circle completes this work, all its efforts threaten to remain within the circle itself, whereas they could help to work out organisational plans. Furthermore, I propose that we should start right away on working out a questionnaire—we must make haste with all this, time does not wait. The Congress may take place very soon. The best thing is to entrust the working out of a questionnaire to a special committee.

III

L e n i n. I have no objections to Comrade Olga's proposal. As for my experience, I do not believe I have any, in view of the rapid change of events and conditions of work. I did draw up a questionnaire, but it was much too general. I propose that experienced comrades should be elected to a committee for drawing up the questionnaire, and that this business should be accelerated to the utmost.

First published in 1934
in *Lenin Miscellany XXVI*

Printed from
the minutes

NOTE BY THE *VPERYOD* EDITORIAL BOARD TO A RESOLUTION BY A GROUP OF WORKERS OF THE ST. PETERSBURG METALWORKS[152]

From the Editors. We publish this resolution by the worker-comrades as a characteristic manifestation of the mood that in certain circumstances may sway a considerable section of the fighting proletariat.* A Party split—especially a secret split—undoubtedly inflicts countless calamities on the labour movement. The above-mentioned Kharkov resolution[153] shows that there are Mensheviks in Russia who are much more conscientious about their Party duty than the comrades abroad. This is also shown by the new declaration issued by the C.C. together with the Majority Committees' Bureau.[154] Let us once again wish success to this latest attempt at unification.

Vperyod No. 14,
April 2 (March 30), 1905

Printed from
the *Vperyod* text
verified with the
original

* The first sentence was written by M. S. Olminsky.—*Ed*.

THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.[155]

APRIL 12-27 (APRIL 25-MAY 10), 1905

1

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS OF THE ORGANISING COMMITTEE FOR CONVENING THE THIRD CONGRESS ON THE REPRESENTATION OF CERTAIN ORGANISATIONS[156]

Caucasus

The Organising Committee, having examined the question of the Caucasian delegation on the basis of the facts published in various writings and the testimony of witnesses, comrades from the Caucasus, has arrived at this unanimous decision:

1. Among the votes at the Congress, it is necessary and solely correct to reckon the 8 votes of the Caucasian delegation, because back in the autumn of 1903, the C.C. approved the Rules of the Caucasian Union Committee, and under these Rules, the Caucasian Union Committee, as a Union Committee, was allowed 8 votes at the Congress.

2. As for the contradictory statements by Comrade Glebov in the Council and the Council's decision in May 1904 to regard temporarily, pending clarification of the question, as votes those of the four separate Caucasian committees (Baku, Batum, Tiflis and Imeretia and Mingrelia), the Organising Committee cannot consider this statement of Glebov's and the Council's decision an obstacle to the adoption of the conclusion stated in §1, since Comrade Glebov has clearly shown himself to be uninformed, which is why he unwittingly misled the Council.

3. Considering it unquestionable that there are now three delegates from the Caucasus with six votes, the O.C. states that Comrade Leonov, member of the Caucasian Union Committee, declares the following concerning the fourth delegate with two votes: the Caucasian Union Committee intended to allow the Batum Committee to approve this fourth delegate. When the Batum Committee gave a vague and evasive reply on this matter, the Caucasian Union Committee, at a sitting attended by Leonov, expressed the wish that in the absence of a special delegate from

Batum at the Congress the votes of the fourth delegate should be transferred to Comrade Kamenev (Yuri).

4. Stating this, the O.C. leaves it to the Congress itself to decide on the question of a fourth delegate from the Caucasian Union Committee.

Kremenchug

Concerning the powers of the Kremenchug Committee the Organising Committee declares:

1) The Kremenchug Committee was approved by the Central Committee only in August 1904, according to Comrade Mark, a member of the C.C., who attended the meeting of the C.C. at which the approval took place.

2) The Kremenchug Committee does not appear on the Party Council's list of 33 empowered organisations, which was published in *Iskra* No. 89.

On the strength of the above stated, the O.C. decides: not to regard the Kremenchug Committee among the full-fledged organisations with the right of vote at the present Congress.

Yekaterinoslav

The Organising Committee, having heard the report of Comrade Morozov, delegate of the Yekaterinoslav Majority Committee, and the written communication of Comrade Yevgeny, member of the old committee in Yekaterinoslav, reached the following unanimous decision:

The Organising Committee does not see any grounds to consider the present Yekaterinoslav Majority Committee less legitimate than the Minority Committee either in formal terms or in terms of succession and ties with local workers.

However, in view of the fact that the O.C. has no opportunity of hearing the explanations of the other side, it does not adopt a decision on the vote of the delegate from the Yekaterinoslav Majority Committee, leaving it to the Congress itself to decide on the matter.

Concerning the powers of the Kazan and Kuban committees, the O.C. has failed to reach any decision, as the votes of the C.C. and the M.C.B. were split.

FROM MARX TO MAO
NOT FOR COMMERCIAL DISTRIBUTION

The M.C.B. believes that these committees cannot be recognised as having the necessary powers because these committees did not appear on the list of committees approved until April 1, 1905, at the Council's sitting in May 1904 (delegates Lenin and Glebov from the C.C.). Even if the Kazan and Kuban committees were approved by the Central Committee after May 1904, they will at any rate be entitled to representation only after one year. Besides, these committees could not have been approved at the general meeting of the C.C. in July 1904, because the minutes of this meeting were in their entirety delivered by Glebov to Lenin abroad, and they contained no information concerning the approval of the Kazan and Kuban committees. Finally, nothing was said about it either at the August or September sitting of the C.C., which was attended by C.C. member Comrade Mark.

The C.C. believes that since these committees were inserted in the *Iskra* list, apparently on behalf of the Party Council, we have no ground for recognising these committees as lacking the required powers.

Written not later than April 11 (24)

Published in 1905 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov* (The Regular Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. Full Text of the Proceedings), Central Committee publication, Geneva

Printed from the original

2

O.C. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CONGRESS[157]

Concerning the point of the agreement between the C.C. and the M.C.B. under which the Congress shall open in the presence of three-quarters of the delegates of the Russian committees, the O.C. resolves:

Both sides, making up the O.C., see this point as meaning that both the C.C. and the M.C.B. should have taken the most vigorous measures to achieve full representation at the Congress and also to guarantee to the Party that the C.C. and the M.C.B. have set themselves the aim of organising an all-Party and not a factional congress. This point

of the agreement was not at all meant to offset the effect of the paragraph of the Party's Rules under which a congress is valid in the presence of one-half of the total number of votes. As for the plenitude of representation at the Congress, all measures have been taken on that score. There is no news only from the Astrakhan and the Crimean committees. The selection of delegates and their dispatch abroad (in two instances, transfer of mandates from the Kuban Committee to comrades abroad, Parvus and a person to be appointed by the *Iskra* Editorial Board) have been carried out by the Don, Gornozavodsk, Kiev, Kuban, Tver, Kharkov, Smolensk, Siberian and Yekaterinoslav committees. Together with the delegates available from 19 committees, we would have, with these 9 committees, a total of 28 committees, that is, more than three-quarters out of 34 committees (the figure of 34 is the maximum number of empowered organisations initially on the O.C. list).

If 9 delegates from the said committees have failed to turn up at the Congress, despite the fact that they were given the corresponding mandates from the committees and arrived abroad, their absence is due to no fault of the O.C., but to the fact that all the efforts of the O.C. to achieve full representation at the Congress were frustrated by the illegal resistance of the three members of the Party Council.

Written not later than April 11 (24)

Published in 1905 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Geneva

Printed from the original

3

SPEECH ON THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE REPORT CONCERNING THE KAZAN COMMITTEE'S REPRESENTATION AT THE CONGRESS[158]

APRIL 13 (26)

References are being made to a statement of mine.* The Kazan man, who has arrived, said that he may possibly have been elected. He should be invited as a member of the

* See p. 150 of this volume.—*Ed.*

committee. I find the end of the Credentials Committee's resolution strange and propose its correction.

First published in 1937 in the book *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P. Protokoly* (The Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. Proceedings)

Printed from the text of the book

4

AMENDMENT TO A CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE PROPOSAL ON THE KAZAN COMMITTEE'S REPRESENTATION AT THE CONGRESS

APRIL 13 (26)

The following amendment is motioned: "Not as a delegate, but as a member of the committee not represented at the Congress but favouring the Congress."

First published in 1931 in *Lenin Miscellany XVI*

Printed from the original

5

SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF A DEBATE ON THE O.C. REPORT

APRIL 13 (26)

I propose that we should take into consideration the statement by Comrade Sosnovsky and others on the desirability of limiting the debate on the O.C. report to the formal aspect only. Comrade Andreyev's resolution fails to achieve its aim.[159] The comrades wanted to have a discussion only on the legality of convening the Congress and not in substance. To discuss the report in substance is equivalent to discussing the Party crisis. The bureau will keep speakers within the limits of a discussion on the legality of convening the Congress.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

6

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE DEBATE ON THE O.C. REPORT

The Congress shall at present debate the O.C. report only from the standpoint of the Congress's validity.*

Motioned on April 13 (26)

Published in 1905 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Geneva

Printed from the text of the book

7

DRAFT AGENDA OF THE THIRD PARTY CONGRESS[160]

A) *Tactical questions.*

1. Armed uprising.

[2. Participation of Social-Democracy in a provisional revolutionary government.]**

2. Preparations for open political action by Social-Democracy.

3. Social-Democracy's attitude to the government's policy on the eve of the revolution, during the revolution and after it.

4. Attitude to the peasant movement.

B) *Attitude to other parties and trends.*

5. Attitude to the splinter section of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

6. Attitude to non-Russian Social-Democratic parties and organisations in Russia.

7. Attitude to the liberals.

8. Attitude to the Socialist-Revolutionaries.

---

* The Minutes Committee recorded the end of the draft resolution as follows: "... the validity of the Congress and its final constitution, and not from the standpoint of the Party crisis".—*Ed.*

** The text in brevier in square brackets is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

C) *Party organisation.*

9. Party Rules.

10. Relations between workers and intellectuals in Party organisations.

D) *Internal Party work.*

11. Delegates' reports.

12. Improvement of propaganda and agitation.

[13. May Day.]*

14. Election of functionaries.

15. Procedure governing the publication of minutes and entry into office of new institutions.

Motioned on April 13 (26)

First published in 1934 in *Lenin Miscellany XXVI*

Printed from the original

8

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE CONGRESS AGENDA

APRIL 13 (26)

I would have no objection to the proposal of Comrades Mikhailov, Voinov and Zimin.[161] But there is a danger that the Congress will overdo the agenda debate. The agenda at German Social-Democratic congresses runs to 5 or 6 items; we had up to 25 at the Second Congress. There is already a danger of our debate getting out of hand. I propose that we adopt as a basis the agenda with a better breakdown.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

9

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE CONGRESS STANDING ORDERS

APRIL 13 (26)

It is dangerous to substitute committees for Congress sittings. The committees discuss many interesting questions

* The text in brevier in square buckets is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed*.

which are then lost and do not get into the minutes. The committees do not have enough time for serious work, and it is not desirable to extend it to the detriment of the Congress work. It would be well to elect a resolutions committee right away, so as to give our work some direction at least. We also need a committee for examining the reports. I doubt whether we need organisational, agrarian and armed uprising committees. We have the old Rules, there is Ivanov's draft, there is Comrade N. F.'s opinion,[162] there is quite enough material.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

10

SPEECH MOTIONING A DRAFT RESOLUTION ON ELECTION OF COMMITTEES TO EXAMINE DELEGATES' REPORTS AND TO DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

APRIL 13 (26)

I motion this resolution: "The Congress shall elect: 1) a committee for examining the delegates' reports and preparing them for communication to the Congress; 2) a committee for appointing rapporteurs and drafting resolutions on the principal items of the agenda."

The speeches of delegates have convinced me that it is the only way we can work fruitfully. If we adopt the system of a general debate and subsequent discussion in committee, the result will be similar to that at the Second Congress. Care must be taken to have the fullest possible publication of the Congress deliberations for the purpose of giving the Party the best information. In view of the atmosphere of suspicion surrounding the Congress, it is especially necessary to give our debates the greatest possible publicity and the fullest record in the minutes.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

11

STATEMENTS TO THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE OF THE CONGRESS

1

To the Credentials Committee of the Congress

At the sitting of the O.C. on April 24, 1905, I forgot to motion a proposal to invite Comrade Arnatsky (*r e a l* [NB] name), a member of the Kazan Committee, to attend the Congress with voice but no vote.[163] I request the Credentials Committee to examine this proposal.

Comrade Arnatsky is abroad, in France, and told me he was ready to attend the Congress at his own expense. He will soon be going to Russia and could swiftly report to his committee on the Congress. Despite all its efforts, the Organising Committee was unable to contact the Kazan Committee or obtain a reply from Kazan. There is therefore almost no hope of the Kazan Committee taking part in the Congress. Our efforts abroad to contact Kazan from over here have likewise failed, and there has been no reply to our letters. Arnatsky has also failed to get in touch with Kazan from over here. In view of the impossibility of having a *delegate* from the Kazan Committee to attend the Congress, should we not invite Comrade Arnatsky, as a *member* of the committee, to attend with *voice but no vote*?

Lenin

Motioned on April 13 (26)

2

To the Credentials Committee

At the O.C. sitting I reported on the written request from Comrade Filatov (real name) for admission to the Congress with voice but no vote. Comrade Filatov is the author of the articles on the uprising in *Vperyod*, signed *V. S.* For the Congress he has prepared a letter and a pamphlet-report: "Application of Tactics and Fortifications to a Popular Uprising" (in a suitcase left in Boulogne). I request

that Comrades Belsky and Voinov who had worked with Comrade Filatov in Paris[164] should be asked to give him a reference.

Lenin

Motioned on April 14 (27)
First published in 1931
in *Lenin Miscellany XVI*

Printed from the original

12

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE'S REPORT[165]

APRIL 14 (27)

I think it would be wrong to have the Congress confirm the organisations immediately. I am opposed to the giving of a vote. I do not agree with Comrade Kamsky about a *coup d'état*.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

13

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON CONFIRMATION OF THE KAZAN AND KUBAN COMMITTEES[166]

The Congress resolves not to count the Kazan and the Kuban committees in constituting the Congress, but to confirm them as full-fledged committees for the future.

Motioned on April 14 (27)
Published in 1905 in the book
Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva

Printed from the original

14

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PROCEDURE GOVERNING VOTING AT THE CONGRESS[167]

The Congress shall henceforth conduct all voting under §7 of the Regulations, separating the votes from the voices.

Motioned on April 14 (27)
Published in 1905 in the book
Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P.
Polny tekst protokolov,
Central Committee publication,
Geneva

Printed from the text of the book

15

REMARKS ON RUMYANTSEV'S DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION OF OPEN POLITICAL ACTION BY THE R.S.D.L.P.

I think the resolution should be reworded as follows: Motives:

(1) stating that under the pressure of the revolutionary movement there is an actual beginning of open action by the political parties, etc.

(2) that in this the liberals have gone especially far, their *actual* privilege (Schmidt's point 1).

(3) that there is a *tremendous urge* among the workers for the same thing (Schmidt's point 2).

—*conclusions*:

(1) no occasion should be missed for open action, the workers to be organised into an independent force *in the course of the action itself*;

(2) even the slightest legal forms should be used in an effort to get the legal labour organisations under Social-Democratic influence;

(3) the idea should be spread in all labour organisations and among the broadest possible masses of the need of taking practical measures to set up, alongside our secret apparatus, an apparatus for open political action.

[+0) The *beginning* of the actual winning of freedom of action.

Better 2) 1)

1) The working masses strive for open action.
2) The liberals are making *intensive* use and are gaining a preponderance.
3) The need to prepare for a possible transition in the near future from the usual, exclusively secret forms of activity to open forms.

Resolves:

1) no occasion should be missed ... open action to be worked out by separate organisations on the spot
2) the use of even partial *legal* forms of organisation in an effort to subject them to Social-Democratic influence.] *

Written between April 16 and 19 (April 29 and May 2), 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

* The text in brevier in square brackets is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed*.

16
THESES FOR A RESOLUTION ON THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS' PARTICIPATION IN A PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT

Motives of the Resolution:

1) The necessity of political freedom and a democratic republic.

[2) The existence of a revolutionary bourgeois and petty-bourgeois democracy able and beginning to fight for it.
3) The necessity of the proletariat's support for revolutionary democracy....]*

4) The necessity of a provisional revolutionary government for the complete overthrow of the autocracy and *actual* guarantees of freedom for a constituent assembly.

[5) Recognition by revolutionary Social-Democracy of revolutionary action not only from below, but also from above.
6) The necessity of Social-Democracy's participation in a provisional revolutionary government in the event of a complete victory for the revolution, where it directs the uprising.]*

7) The bourgeois-democratic character of the revolution and the necessity of the proletariat's taking an independent position as distinct from bourgeois democracy.

[8) The existence of an organised Social-Democratic Labour Party capable of open organisation (with broad participation of the workers) and control over the Party's authorised agents;]*

Resolutive Section of the Resolution

on Social-Democratic Participation in a Provisional Revolutionary Government

1) The propaganda and agitation for the idea of a provisional revolutionary government as a necessary component part of a victorious revolution.
2) Discussion of the whole of our minimum programme at workers' meetings not only from a general standpoint, as

* The text in brevier in square brackets is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

we all have discussed and should discuss the maximum programme, but from the standpoint of the possibility of its full and immediate implementation.

3) Recognition that *in the event of a victorious popular uprising* the Social-Democrats may take part in a provisional revolutionary government together with the revolutionary bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois democrats for the purpose of conducting a relentless struggle against all counter-revolutionary attempts, for the purpose of completely clearing the democratic soil in Russia, for the purpose of using all the means ensured by the government for the broadest possible organisation of the working class.

These are subjective conditions. What about the objective ones? for the purpose of carrying on a relentless struggle against the counter-revolution. P. 3.

4) Necessary condition of such participation—control by the Social-Democratic Labour Party over its authorised representatives in the government and undeviating protection of the independent working-class party, hostile to all manner of bourgeois democracy in its striving for a full socialist revolution.

{NB *Armed* proletariat}

5) At any rate, regardless of whether or not the Social-Democrats succeed in taking part in a provisional revolutionary government, the idea must be spread in the working class of the necessity of independent workers' *revolutionary* organisations to exercise control over *every* revolutionary government and to exert pressure on it.

Written before April 18 (May 1), 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

17

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE QUESTION OF OPEN POLITICAL ACTION BY THE R.S.D.L.P.[168]

APRIL 19 (MAY 2)

Comrade Sergeyev is wrong. We have before us the integrated question of changing the character of Social-Democratic activity, and that is what the resolution states.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

18

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE GOVERNMENT'S TACTICS ON THE EVE OF A REVOLUTION

APRIL 19 (MAY 2)

1

I agree with Comrade Belsky's opinion.[169] We tend to minimise the concept of revolution when using this word in relation to the mere wresting of a few paltry rights.

2

I agree that "revolutionary way" is an expression for a more vigorous conduct of struggle, but this tends to minimise the concept of revolution. I propose either that we replace it by the words "regardless of the law", or that after "revolutionary way" we delete the words "minimal programme", as it could be taken to mean that we want to carry through the whole revolution in this way.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

19
RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TO THE PEASANT MOVEMENT

1) Whereas the currently growing peasant movement, though spontaneous and politically unconscious, is nonetheless inevitably directed against the existing political order and against all the remnants of the serf-owning system in general;

2) Whereas it is one of the tasks of Social-Democracy to support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order;

3) Whereas, in view of the aforesaid, the Social-Democrats must strive to purge the revolutionary-democratic content of the peasant movement of all manner of reactionary admixtures, developing the peasants' revolutionary class-consciousness, and consistently putting through their democratic demands;

4) Whereas the Social-Democratic Party, as the party of the proletariat, must in all cases and under all circumstances work steadfastly for the independent organisation of the rural proletariat and clarify for this class the irreconcilable antagonisms between its interests and those of the peasant bourgeoisie;

—The Third Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party instructs all Party organisations

a) to carry on propaganda among broad sections of the people explaining that Social-Democracy sets itself the task of giving the most vigorous support to all revolutionary measures of the peasantry capable of improving its condition, including the confiscation of landlord, government, church, monastery and crown lands;

b) as a practical slogan for agitation among the peasantry and as a means of instilling the utmost political consciousness into the peasant movement, to urge the necessity for the immediate organisation of revolutionary peasant committees, with the aim of carrying through all revolutionary-democratic reforms in order to release the peasantry from the tyranny of the police, the officials and the landlords;

c) with the aim of disorganising the autocracy and maintaining the revolutionary onslaught against it, to urge the peasantry and the rural proletariat to engage in all possible political demonstrations, collectively refuse to pay duties and taxes, to perform military service or obey the decrees and orders of the government and its agents;

d) to strive for the independent organisation of the rural proletariat, for its integration with the urban proletariat under the banner of the Social-Democratic Party, and for the election of its representatives to the peasant committees.

Motioned on April 20 (May 3)

Published in 1905 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Geneva

Printed from the original

20

TO THE PRESIDIUM OF THE CONGRESS[170]

I consider it timely to adopt a resolution (on the attitude of the workers to the intellectuals).

Lenin

Written on April 20 (May 3), 1905

First published in 1934 in *Lenin Miscellany XXVI*

Printed from the original

21

OUTLINE OF A SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN WORKERS AND INTELLECTUALS IN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC ORGANISATIONS[171]

Outline of my speech on May 3 (15th sitting).

I. It is not right to say (as Vlasov did) that in our country it is the intellectuals that are mainly the exponents of revolutionary Social-Democratic ideas.

II. It is not right to say (as Vlasov did) that the elective principle will not make for better information of the outlying districts, etc.

III. Vlasov said that it is the intellectuals that are at the head (of splits and oppositions). This is confirmed by Latyshev, Lyadov, Kramolnikov, etc.

IV. *Workers* ***must*** *be brought into the committees.*

Written on April 20 (May 3), 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

22

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE PARTY RULES[172]

APRIL 21 (MAY 4)

1

Comrade Kitayev's proposal is more practical, for under it the convocation of an emergency congress demands a quorum equal to one-half of the number of votes at the preceding congress.

2

On the contrary, things are facilitated by the establishment of the specified number required to convene a congress. The required number of votes is established after each congress. One addition only is necessary, and that is a note under which the list of committees confirmed by the C.C. shall be published in the C.O.

3

The list of newly confirmed organisations shall be published immediately in the Party C.O., with a statement of the time of their confirmation by the C.C.

4

I am in favour of the initial wording of §6 carried *Vperyod*,[173] as otherwise there is an irregularity.

5

I agree with the opinion of Comrade Petrov and the others. Comrade Belsky's proposal should be inserted in the note.[174]

6

In the interests of the C.O. I must come out in favour of Comrade Kitayev's amendment. With the newspaper issued weekly, there is need to be informed of developments and have sufficient quantities of material.[175]

7

I favour unanimous co-optation.[176] The C.C. is not big and for the sake of positive effort and political direction, we must ensure that its members are like-minded.

8

I agree with Comrade Kuznetsov: § 13 should be deleted from the Rules and the corresponding resolution tabled by Comrade Belsky in the Bureau adopted.[177]

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

23

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ON GENERAL MEETINGS OF THE C.C.[178]

APRIL 21 (MAY 4)

I favour Maximov's resolution. If it is difficult to get together once in three months, the period could be extended to four months. The C.C. member abroad must know everything and take part in deciding on the most important matters. If there is difficulty for all to get together, a meeting does not have to be full.

First published in 1924 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. 1905 goda. Polny tekst protokolov*

Printed from the text of the book

24

SPEECH ON THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE KAZAN COMMITTEE'S REPRESENTATION[179]

APRIL 22 (MAY 5)

Lenin makes a reference to the minutes of the Second Congress showing that the Kazan Committee was listed as one of the organisations whose powers required formal confirmation. Since no formal confirmation has been forthcoming, there is no ground to rescind the resolution already taken by the Congress. The Kazan representative must remain at the Congress with voice only, while the committee, according to the Credentials Committee's proposal, should seek formal confirmation right away.

First published in 1937 in the book *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P. Protokoly*

Printed from the text of the book

25

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN WORKERS AND INTELLECTUALS IN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC ORGANISATIONS

APRIL 22 (MAY 5)

I object to any examination of the resolutions one by one to avoid fragmentation and propose that they should be referred to committee for consolidation. In particular, concerning Comrade Kitayev's opinion that the Party committees should consist of organisers only, let me say that they alone would be insufficient for the functioning of the committees.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

26

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE ADDITIONAL RESOLUTION TO THE PARTY RULES ON PERIODIC CONFERENCES OF REPRESENTATIVES OF VARIOUS PARTY ORGANISATIONS[180]

APRIL 22 (MAY 5)

1

I should have no objection to this, but isn't the C.C. being burdened with too much work by being asked to organise these conferences?

I propose that instead of "the C.C. should organise" we say: "both the Central and the local committees should organise", and instead of "conferences of representatives of local committees", say: "conferences of representatives of various organisations of our Party".

2

That is right. I am against any additions which introduce nothing but formalism and red tape.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

27

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE SPLINTER SECTION OF THE PARTY[181]

The Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. authorises the Central Committee to take all measures to prepare and work out conditions for a merger with the splinter section of the R.S.D.L.P., the final approval of these conditions to be left to a new Party congress.

NB: not subject to publication

Motioned on April 23 (May 6)

First published in 1924 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. 1905 goda. Polny tekst protokolov*

Printed from the original

28

SPEECH ON RUMYANTSEV'S RESOLUTION ON THE SPLINTER SECTION OF THE PARTY[182]

APRIL 23 (MAY 6)

I find the first part unacceptable: how, given the split, is one to refrain from agitating? As for dissolving the Menshevik committees, that should be done with extreme caution.

First published in 1924 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. 1905 goda. Polny tekst protokolov*

Printed from the text of the book

29

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS NON-RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC ORGANISATIONS[183]

APRIL 23 (MAY 6)

We are being offered something unacceptable. What, after all, does Comrade Mikhailov want? Does he want the agreements to be concluded only by the C.C. and local committees jointly? But the C.C.'s general resolutions are binding on local committees. It is unreasonable to consider the special case in which the Menshevik C.C. got something wrong. The local committees should also be allowed to display initiative. We should authorise the local committees as well to co-ordinate the activity with Social-Democratic organisations locally. If the C.C. does not happen to find itself in conditions where it cannot be located, it will, of course, always be consulted.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

30

SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF THE ATTITUDE TO THE LIBERALS

APRIL 23 (MAY 6)

It is inappropriate to raise the question of agreements with the liberals. Things in Russia have reached the point of an uprising, and in such conditions an agreement is highly unlikely. Even if some *Osvobozhdeniye* groups or liberal-minded students willing to act arms in hand are to be found, we really cannot conclude an agreement with a man like Struve.

Adds to Comrade Voinov's report on the Zemstvo congress in Moscow (quotes *The Times*).[184]

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

31

SPEECH ON THE REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE C.C.[185]

APRIL 25 (MAY 8)

I am being accused of contradicting myself in the matter of the trial. If the Congress were a general one, the question of the trial would have been raised even earlier, but everything that has gone before clearly shows what the matter was. The C.C. is unable to make a report, because it is confused. The way out for the C.C. was found in the same thing: the Congress, which met later than it should have done. When the "accused pleads guilty", there is no need for any judicial proceedings.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

32

PROPOSAL ON PROCEDURE GOVERNING ELECTION TO THE C.C.

APRIL 25 (MAY 8)

I propose that we should first determine the number of persons we need to elect, conduct the election by secret ballot, and then come to an agreement concerning the extent to which the results of the vote shall be made public.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

33

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE TIME OF THE C.C.'S ENTRY INTO OFFICE

The Congress resolves that its newly elected C.C. shall enter upon the exercise of its office immediately.[186]

Motioned on April 25 (May 8), 1905

Published in 1905 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Geneva

Printed from the original

34

SPEECH ON THE PUBLICATION OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.

APRIL 25 (MAY 8)

The Chairman points out that the question to what extent the Congress proceedings are to be reduced cannot be predetermined. All the debate concerning the agenda should be left out; he adds furthermore that the technical facilities abroad will have to be arranged from scratch and this may affect the speed of publication of the Congress proceedings.

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

35

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PROPAGANDA AND AGITATION[187]

The Resolution as a Whole

a) Organise a literary-propagandist group to work out a general propaganda programme an to compile in conformity with it a series of popular booklets on the principal questions of the Party programme, tactics and organisation.*

a) Give special attention to the publication of pamphlets for work among the peasantry.

b) Make arrangements for the publication of a popular organ in Russia.

point c) substitute

adopted

c) Take measures to organise travelling groups of agitators and propagandists to help local centres.[188]

Lenin

Written on April 25 (May 8), 1905

Published in 1905 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Geneva

Printed from the original

36

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE EVENTS IN THE CAUCASUS

APRIL 26 (MAY 9)

1

It is wrong to say that the Party undertakes to appoint an uprising when the Caucasus starts a revolution. We merely authorise the C.C. to support the movement.**

* The text of the draft resolution is given in brevier.—*Ed.*

** The records of the Minutes Committee give the end of the speech as follows:

"We merely authorise the C.C. to support the movement but the conclusion does not follow that we should only agitate and propagandise, taking account of the situation in the Caucasus. I call everyone's attention to this paragraph.

"No one has requested the floor. The debate *is closed*."—*Ed.*

2

On the whole I agree with Comrade Petrov's amendment,[189] although it does not contain any revolutionary call.*

Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov, Central Committee publication, Geneva, 1905

Printed from the text of the book

PLAN FOR A REPORT ON THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P. AND ITS DECISIONS[190]

The Third Congress and Its Decisions

A) Why did we have a congress and a conference?
B) The organisational question at the Congress and at the conference.
C) Tactical questions " ~ " ~ " ~ "

A)
1. Legality of *convoking* the Congress without the Council.
2. Validity of the Congress *itself*.
3. Why not attend the Congress? (One congress turned into two.)

B) Three main points of the organisational work of the Third Congress:

Bb)
1) §1.
2) "Single centre."
3) "Guarantees of the minority's rights."

Bc) Organisational Rules of the conference.
(1) Directing "collectives" (?).
(2) "Local organisation" (? and §1?).

C) (3) C.C. and E.C.—and O.C. [???]

(4) Terms of agreement? [at the Congress?]

4.1. Provisional revolutionary government.

* The records of the Minutes Committee give the speech as follows: "L e n i n. Shouldn't we add 'to the proletariat and the peasantry of Russia'? Rybkin has just said the resolution could state that the Caucasus should not start an uprising until Russia is capable of supporting it. But this would require a change in the whole resolution. The important thing is the testimonials of local men. On the whole, I agree with Comrade Petrov's amendment, although it does not contain any revolutionary call."—*Ed*.

3.2. Armed uprising.
2.3. Present political situation.
1.4. Attitude to other revolutionary and opposition parties.
5.5. Executive Committee.
4.4. C.C. = E.C. + representatives of regional committees = conference.
3.3. Regional committees = elected at regional congresses.
2.2. Regional congresses = delegates of directing collectives.

1. Directing collective = committee + all district committees + special group.

The committee submits reports to district committees and dispatches, submits its "poll" to them.

The committee is almost wholly elected by members of district committees.

groups of local organisation
Some Menshevik compliments:
"gross breach of promise"
"foisting congress on the Party"
"unprecedented crime"
"betrayal of the Party's trust"
"high-handed trick"
"juggling"

"doing violence to the will of the organised proletariat (p. 13)

Menshevik terms
"*the whole Party*, i.e., the mass of its effective members, must be represented" p. 8

"how can tactical questions be decided without a preliminary discussion by the whole Party? Is it not flippant ... armed uprising ... even the writers have just started a discussion" (p. 10)
"we have heard" (pp. 10-11).

Written after May 15 (28), 1905
First published in 1931
in *Lenin Miscellany XVI*

Printed from
the original

REMARKS ON THE ARTICLE "ON A PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT"[191]

1. Does it follow from Marx's "Address" to the Communists in March 1850[192] that Marx *regarded it as inconceivable* for Communists to take part in a provisional revolutionary government together with the bourgeoisie in the epoch of a democratic revolution?

2. Is it true that in this "Address" Marx *did not even raise the question* of Social-Democratic participation in a provisional revolutionary government?

3. Is there any difference between: "regard participation as inconceivable" and "not to raise the question of participation"?

4. Is it true that in this "Address" Marx himself noted a strengthening of the petty-bourgeois democratic party and a weakening of the Communist workers' party in the recent period?

5. ...*

Written before May 21 (June 3), 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

ESSAY ON THE PARTY SPLIT[193]

Economism and the old *Iskra* 1900-1903.	1) Economism and the old *Iskra*. (1901 Congress resolutions.)[194]
Second Party Congress. July 1903.	2) Second Congress. 51 = = 8 + 10 + 9 + 24.[195] (= = Economists and the old *Iskra*.)
Struggle for co-optation or "a state of siege" August-November 1903.	3) August 26, 1903-November 26, 1903.[196] (Never with Martynov![197] "Continuity." Letter of October 8, 1903[198]).

* Here the MS. breaks off.—*Ed.*

to 5.

{Clanishness and the Party! peace with the Economists! Lenin's "heresies". November 1903-January 1904.}

4) November 26, 1903-January 7, 1904. [Secret organisation.]

Efforts at reconciliation *old and new "Iskra"* ("gulf"). January-July 1904.

5) January 7, 1904-? July 9, 1904.

Russian committees and the *Iskra* Editorial Board. "22" and "19".[199] Struggle for congress. Denunciatory "document".

Struggle for congress. July 1904-May 1905.

6) July 1904-May 1905.

Majority Committees' Bureau = 3 conferences. *Vperyod*.

"Plan for Zemstvo campaign."

Third Party Congress. May 1905.

7) May 1905. Congress and conference.

After Third Congress. June 1905—

8) Après le III Congress.[200]

Written not earlier than May 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

THE LATEST NEWS REPORT

The *Potemkin* has appeared off Feodosia.[201] It has restocked its food supply and has sailed for an unknown destination, having seized a Russian merchant ship with a cargo of

cattle. It is reported that it has also obtained some coal from a British merchant ship. There is no question at all of surrender. The *Potemkin* has set itself the task of sparking off an uprising in all the coastal cities. Here is the text of a *manifesto* which the *Potemkin* is circulating (according to a report by a German newspaper from Bucharest).

"To all civilised citizens and to the working people! The crimes of the autocratic government have exhausted all patience. The whole of Russia, burning with indignation, exclaims: Down with the chains of bondage! The government wants to drown the country in blood, forgetting that the troops consist of sons of the oppressed people. The crew of the *Potemkin* has taken the first decisive step. We refuse to go on acting as the people's hangman. Our slogan is: freedom for the whole Russian people or death! We demand an end to the war and the immediate convocation of a constituent assembly on the basis of universal suffrage. That is the aim for which we shall fight to the end: victory or death! All free men, all workers will be on our side in the struggle for liberty and peace. Down with the autocracy! Long live the constituent assembly!"

Proletary No. 7
July 10 (June 27), 1905

Printed from the *Proletary* text verified with the original

NOTE BY THE COMMITTEE FOR PUBLICATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE R.S.D.L.P. THIRD CONGRESS TO THE TEXT OF THE MINUTES

Concerning the number of votes at the Congress, the Minutes Committee requests readers to bear the following in mind. At the Congress, there were 46 votes represented by 23 delegates, of whom one had one vote, one had three and the rest, two each. (With the arrival of Comrade Golubin, i.e., from the 18th sitting on, there were 24 delegates.) Almost all the voting at the Congress was counted according to the number of delegates, i.e., for the sake of simplicity, it was assumed that all the delegates had one vote each.

That is why the number of votes for and against adds up to 23 and not to 46. It goes without saying that this simplification of the count could not have any effect on the results, because both the number of votes for and the number of votes against were equally halved. There was not a single instance of a division of votes where a decision depended on a single comrade with three votes.

Written not later than July 1905
Published in 1905 in the book *Trety ocherednoi syezd R.S.D.R.P. Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Geneva
Printed from the original

DRAFT LEAFLET [202]

To All Citizens!

To the Russian People
and to All the Peoples of Russia

1. Full-scale war—bloodshed—fusillade of January 9—barricades in Riga—Caucasus, Poland—Odessa, etc., etc.—Peasant revolts.
2. Over what?

   Constituent assembly. *F r e e d o m s* for the people.

   Trade

3. Government's response. Fraud of the Zemstvo people. The government issues the challenge. The Army and the Navy vacillate.
4. What is to be done? Revolutionary army and revolutionary government.
5. All class-conscious workers, all honest democrats, all peasants prepared for the struggle must rally together and organise in groups and detachments of the *revolutionary army*, obtaining arms, electing their commanders, and keeping themselves prepared to do everything to help the uprising.

6. Establishment of a revolutionary government should be stated as the aim. Consolidation of the uprising. Concentration of people's forces. *Organisation of freedom and struggle for freedom.*

7. The slogans and aims of the revolutionary government.

Five principal—central—foundation of people's form of government

(1) Constituent assembly.
[and elections]
(2) Arming of the people.
(3) Freedom.
(4) Peasant committees.
(5) Liberation of oppressed nationalities.
(6) 8-hour working day.

8. Revolutionary army and revolutionary government. Workers, organise! Try to direct the crowd! Draw in the peasants!

Written in July 1905
First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*
Printed from the original

OUTLINE OF TACTICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BOLSHEVIKS AND MENSHEVIKS OVER THE ATTITUDE TO THE BULYGIN DUMA

[1)] Intensified agitation over the law on the Duma.] *

2) Support for the Left wing of bourgeois democracy proposing to boycott the Duma.
3) Intensified agitation against the Duma over the elections and during them.
4) The central slogans of agitation:
armed uprising
revolutionary army
provisional revolutionary government
(6 points).

[1)] Idem] *

* The text in square brackets is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

2) None.
3) Intensified agitation not so much against the Duma as for the election of more resolute men.
4) Agitation slogans:
   constituent assembly
   people's agitation committees
   illegal representation
   revolutionary self-government.

Written between August 11 and 23 (August 24 and September 5), 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

REMARKS ON THE QUESTION OF ELECTIONS TO THE BULYGIN DUMA

1) To participate and elect only the supporters of the autocracy (*Moskovskiye Vedomosti*[203]).
2) *To participate and elect only liberals* (*Vestnik Yevropy*,[204] *Rus*,[205] *Osvobozhdeniye*, etc., etc.).
3) To participate and elect only determined supporters of democratic and free representation (*Iskra*).
4) *To participate and elect only those who have imperative mandates* (Kiev lawyers).
5) To participate and elect only with a revolutionary commitment (Cherevanin in *Iskra*).
6) Active boycott with a slogan for a popular representative constituent assembly (Bund).
7) Active boycott with slogans for an armed uprising, revolutionary army and revolutionary government (*Proletary*[206]).

{ *A p a r t**: a popular representative constituent assembly to be elected independently through spontaneous generation. }

(*Iskra* and *partially* Bund.)[207]

Written after August 19 (September 1), 1905

First published in 1926 in *Lenin Miscellany V*

Printed from the original

* Apart.—*Ed.*

PLAN FOR AN ARTICLE "THE PRINCIPAL TASK OF SOCIALIST POLICY"[208]

The Principal Task of Socialist Policy

An independent *political party* of the proletariat with a clear-cut *socialist* programme.

First application in practice.

"C.D."[209] Its (objective) tasks. Cf. *Nasha Zhizn*,[210] September 18: win over the people, increase the people's confidence, etc., etc.

Cf. ibid. concerning the formation of the C.D. Party and the denial in *Birzheviye Vedomosti*.[211]

Is this confidence to be destroyed or maintained on certain "*conditions*"?

Vacillation by the new-*Iskra* men (Parvus, Cherevanin, Martov: "election of resolute men").

Unconditional struggle against the C.D.s. "Conciliators." Beginning of betrayal.

Objections: 1) "absenteeism". Slander. On the contrary, the most active agitation.*

2) support for revolutionary bourgeoisie. Ça dépend.** In parliament? Yes. If we are to choose between the conservatives and the C.D.s? Yes. But just now there is neither the one, nor the other, because there is *no parliamentarism as yet*. Struggle for it. Betrayal in struggle. A real*** support for the C.D.s at the present time means *revolutionary struggle* and uprising. In the street or in parliament? (Cf. Marx über Ledru Rollin. 1849.[212])

The use of legal and semi-legal means? Unquestionably, yes. Labour congress?—Yes. Meetings? Yes. But to make use of something which is close does not signify merger or diffusion. To make use of it, one must be independent, whole and united.

---

* These two phrases are in English in the original.—*Ed.*

** Depending on the circumstances.—*Ed.*

*** Two possibilities: (1) The Duma merely grumbles. (2) The Duma struggles for a government of the *bourgeoisie*. (Tertium non datur. The Duma cannot struggle *consistently* for the revolution.) In the *first* and in the *second* case, an uprising is decisive. To (2)—a convenient pretext, nothing more. The danger of Petrunkevich & Co. in power.

The absurdity of the new-*Iskra* tactics: "agreement and support" plus "mock elections as a possible motive for an uprising". There can be 1,000 and 1 pretexts.

No. The tactic is now different: 1) Ruthless struggle against the C.D. conciliators. 2) Badgering them for having gone into the Duma. 3) Development of an independent Social-Democratic party in the struggle against the C.D.s and while agitating over the State Duma. 4) Preparation for an uprising which is coming and which—and not "parliamentarism"—is *n o w* the crux of the situation. 5) The use for this preparation, this agitation of all semi-legal and legal means. 6) Concentration on these slogans: armed uprising, revolutionary army, provisional revolutionary government.

Written after September 18 (October 1), 1905

First published in 1931 in *Lenin Miscellany XVI*

Printed from the original

NOTE[213]

Dialogue Between an *Osvobozhdeniye* Man and a Social-Democrat

Pp.		
1)	impossibility of an uprising after the *Potemkin*.	—The impossible *becomes* (werden) possible.
2)	reappraisal of the forces.	—"you are wretched,* and you are rich."[214]
3)	K. Kautsky on a provisional revolutionary government.	—the uprising is connected with a provisional revolutionary government. Recognition of the uprising by the government = martial law.
4)	unwisdom of the idea of boycott: failure to use the instruments.	—Once again learn from your enemies, if you don't believe your friends. The government's fear of a boycott.

* Total "wretchedness" from the standpoint of military technique, etc. But have a look at the movement and its spontaneous growth: January 9—Riga—Poland—1.5-million-strong strike—Odessa—Caucasus—Moscow. September 1905.

5) the uprising and "elderly" workers. Trade unionism. "A class party."
6) parliamentary rule: support neighbours, otherwise you will help *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*.

—"*non-combatants*." Indeed, it is correct to use them for trade unionism, but they will provide a *rearguard*.
—indeed, in parliament we shall support you against *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, when such is the choice, but that is not the point just now. The struggle is not in parliament, but over a parliament. You are not fighters.

Written in late September 1905
First published in 1931 in *Lenin Miscellany XVI*
Printed from the original

RUSSIA'S FINANCES

We have repeatedly pointed out that the autocratic government is more and more confused over its financial affairs (tricks would be an apter word, I think). It is increasingly obvious that a financial collapse is inevitable. Here is an interesting confirmation of this. The Berlin correspondent of the London *Economist*,[215] one of the most influential organs of the European financial barons, reported on October 11 as follows:

"A representative of the Mendelssohn Bank has been in St. Petersburg this week to take part in the negotiations between the Russian Government and French bankers for the much-heralded new Russian loan. According to apparently authentic statements given out here, the amount to be raised will be about £75,000,000 [about 700 million rubles], of which France is to take about half, while the rest is to be offered in Germany, Holland, England, and the United States. It is also stated that a large part of the issue is to be devoted to taking up the Treasury notes placed in France and Germany during the war.

That Russia should appeal to the money markets at just this juncture, when all the great centres are under unusual pressure, is taken as striking evidence of its financial straits. One version of the story, however, has it that only a small part of the sum above mentioned is to be offered for subscription now, while the rest will be raised later, presumably early next year. But this only increases the unfavourable

impression as to the urgency of Russia's needs. That there is no enthusiasm in Germany for a Russian loan just at this moment goes without saying. Not only the condition of the money market here, but, more than all, the continuance of political turmoil in Russia, and the visible weakening, not to say breakdown, of Governmental authority there, are facts that are being weighed in Germany in a manner that augurs ill for the forthcoming subscription."

Written after October 1 (14), 1905
First published in 1931 in *Lenin Miscellany XVI*
Printed from the original

INSERTIONS FOR V. KALININ'S ARTICLE "THE PEASANT CONGRESS"[216]

1

We see, consequently, that class-conscious socialists must unconditionally support the revolutionary struggle of all, even the prosperous, peasants against the officials and landowners, but class-conscious socialists must make the clear and straightforward statement that the "general redistribution"[217] the peasants want falls very far short of socialism. Socialism demands the abolition of the power of money, the power of capital, the abolition of all private ownership of the means of production, the abolition of the commodity economy. Socialism demands that the land and the factories should be handed over to the working people organising large-scale (instead of scattered small-scale) production under a general plan.

The peasant struggle for land and liberty is a great step towards socialism, but it is still a very far cry from socialism itself.

2

... The tactical resolution adopted by the Congress is truly astounding by its meagreness. We are inclined to think that there some of the peasant well-wishers (liberals) must have done some more "explaining" .

Here is the resolution:

"The activity of the Peasant Union, depending on local conditions, may be either open or secret (conspiratorial). All members of the

Union must spread their views and seek to realise their demands in every possible way, being undeterred by the resistance on the part of the Zemstvo chiefs, the police and other authorities. Among other things, they are insistently advised to make use of their right to draw up public decisions at village and volost meetings and private gatherings concerning improvements in state amenities and improvement of the people's welfare."

That kind of resolution is extremely unsatisfactory. Instead of a revolutionary call for an uprising, it merely gives liberal advice of a general sort. Instead of organising a revolutionary party, the resolution only organises an annex to the liberal party. The progress of the movement itself will inevitably and inescapably split up the liberal landowners and the revolutionary peasants, and we Social-Democrats will try to accelerate this split.

Proletary No. 25
November 16 (3), 1905

Printed from the *Proletary* text verified with the original

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE POWERS OF REPRESENTATION OF THE DISTRICT AND THE VYBORG ORGANISATIONS AT THE ST. PETERSBURG CITY CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.[218]

FEBRUARY 11 (24), 1906

1

Comrade Dan has no knowledge of parliamentary tactics. In all the countries of Western Europe a member of the bureau is not deprived of the right to motion proposals.

2

There are two proposals: a decision on the question of the 56 votes, and exclusion of the whole district organisation from the conference. I request a vote.

3

I request a vote on the following question: can a section of the St. Petersburg organisation here be deprived of representation?

4

I request my proposal to be put to the vote first: does the assembly agree to vote on Comrade Martov's proposal?

5

Comrade Nikolai motioned a proposal which he very correctly called radical[219]; when a motioned proposal supersedes all the others, it is voted on first.

First published in 1930 in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia* No. 12

Printed from secretarial notes preserved in the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the C.P.S.U. Central Committee

THE UNITY CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.[220]

APRIL 10-25 (APRIL 23-MAY 8), 1906

1

SPEECHES AT THE SECOND SITTING OF THE CONGRESS CONCERNING THE ROLL-CALL VOTE ON THE WRITTEN STATEMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS BUREAU[221]

1

I second Comrade Schmidt's proposal and invite all those wishing to support this proposal to give their signatures.

2

Comrade Larin's proposal is nothing but the grossest kind of mockery of the Congress minority by the majority....

I repeat: this is gross mockery of the rights of the minority at the Congress, it is an attempt to destroy the guarantees of the rights of the minority held out by the standing orders.

First published in 1907 in the book *Protokoly Obyedinitelnogo syezda R.S.D.R.P., sostoyavshegosya v Stokgolme v 1906 godu* (Proceedings of the Unity Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. held in Stockholm in 1906), Moscow

Printer from the text of the book

2

SPEECH AT THE THIRD SITTING OF THE CONGRESS

Lenin objects to Dan's point[222] and speaks for the need to discuss the question of assessing the current situation and for putting the question of nationalities on the agenda.

First published in 1907 in the book *Protokoly Obyedinitelnogo syezda R.S.D.R.P., sostoyavshegosya v Stokgolme v 1906 godu*, Moscow

Printer from the text of the book

3

PROPOSAL ON FORMULATING POINT VIII OF THE DRAFT AGENDA FOR THE CONGRESS

To point VIII: "Attitude to the demand of a special constituent assembly for Poland", add the words: "in connection with the national question in the Party Programme".

First published in 1907 in the book *Protokoly Obyedinitelnogo syezda R.S.D.R.P., sostoyavshegosya v Stokgolme v 1906 godu*, Moscow

Printer from the text of the book

4

WRITTEN STATEMENT AT THE 15TH SITTING OF THE CONGRESS

The very first page of our resolutions says: "the class interests in a *bourgeois revolution*",[223] line 27 from the top.

First published in 1907 in the book *Protokoly Obyedinitelnogo syezda R.S.D.R.P., sostoyavshegosya v Stokgolme v 1906 godu*, Moscow

Printer from the text of the book

5

SPEECH AT THE 24TH SITTING OF THE CONGRESS[224]

I believe I shall express the will of the entire Congress in extending, on behalf of the Russian Social-Democratic Party, greetings to its new members and in expressing the wish that this unity should be the best earnest of our further successful struggle.

First published in 1907 in the book *Protokoly Obyedinitelnogo syezda R.S.D.R.P., sostoyavshegosya v Stokgolme v 1906 godu*, Moscow

Printer from the text of the book

AMONG THE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

Rech[225] is resentful over the fact that in view of the rumours of a semi-Cadet, semi-bureaucratic ministry, the Left-wing press has begun to talk of a horse-trading deal between the Cadets and the camarilla, of a betrayal which is inevitable in any such deals.

"Is it necessary to prove that these assertions are false and absurd?" writes the indignant *Rech*.

It appears, Messrs. Cadets, that it is, and even highly, necessary to do so, because in the same article ("Famine and Politics") we read:

"This struggle (between the Duma and the present ministry), a slow and hard struggle, has resulted, however, in the question concerning a responsible cabinet being brought down from the sphere of abstract Considerations to the soil of concrete reality, and in it being discussed as one of the real possibilities."

That is very good. But what about the question of dissolving the State Council, the question of amnesty, the question of universal, etc., suffrage? Have all *these* questions likewise become "real possibilities" *already*? Surely, they have not, have they? After all, there is so far not even a rumour about them.

That being so, what is one to do? "It is necessary to prove."

Written on June 24 (July 7), 1906
Published on June 25, 1906 in the newspaper *Ekho* No. 4
Printed from the *Ekho* text

AMONG THE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

On second thoughts, *Rech* finds that the general has asked much too much for his patronage of the Cadet ministry and it declares that the Cadets will not give up the principle of compulsory alienation of the land in favour of the peasants and total amnesty, whatever portfolios they may be offered. We think that the general, being the practical statesman that he is, will see no reason for spoiling the deal over a matter of principle. After all, under the Cadet plan not the whole of the land is subject to compulsory alienation, but only as much as has to be allocated to the peasants to enable them to pay the state taxes; furthermore, the owners of the alienated land are to be paid in cash "on a fair valuation" and these days money is ever so much easier to manage than land, which no longer brings in as much income as before, in view of the stubborn refusal of the peasants to cultivate it for others. As for the amnesty, the Cadets have already done their duty to the country by informing the supreme authorities of the people's unanimous desire to see prisoners and exiles at liberty, and, to refrain from encroaching on the inalienable prerogative of the crown in this business, have decided to kill the amnesty bill which the Trudovik group intends to table in the Duma.[226] What the devil does General Trepov still want? Let's have done with the bargaining, General, and hand over the reins to the new driver, "without any pangs,

without any fatal brooding, and without futile and empty doubts": after all, in case of failure the "extreme measures" will still be at your disposal....

Written on June 27 (July 10), 1906

Published on June 28, 1906 in the newspaper *Ekho* No. 6

Printed from the *Ekho* text

AMONG THE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

Following the unsuccessful affair of the Cadet-Octobrist-official ministry, the government has tried to scare the Cadets with the prospect of a dictatorship. Now the Cadets are trying to scare the government with the prospect of a revolution. *Rech* writes:

"The conflagration is spreading—such is the impression of the news coming by cable from every corner of Russia.... It is no longer the revolutionary intelligentsia or even the working class that is aflame; the peasantry, the troops are aflame too. That is, it is more correct to say that the whole of Russia is in flames.... At the slightest pretext, the peasants flock in their thousands to deal summarily with the authorities, the landowners, the estates and the manors."

On the subject of this "conflagration", Prof. Gredeskul hastens to show the depth of his understanding of the historical events:

"We are undoubtedly on the eve of crucial events. *Either the government will come to its senses within the next few days and hand the power over to a Duma ministry, or it will bring us to the greatest disasters.*"

And so, it is either a revolution or a Cadet ministry. It is not surprising at all that a Cadet tries to use everything, the people's spontaneous revolutionary activity above all, to demonstrate the need for a Cadet ministry. However, he is labouring under a delusion: the antidote—a Cadet ministry—which the Cadet quacks are now prescribing for the revolution will not work against the poison of spontaneous revolutionary action by the mass, against its urge, to which *Rech* itself testifies, to realise its right to freedom of assembly (not the Cadet freedom of assembly, but full freedom) and to all the land.

You can go on trying hard, gentlemen, but the revolution has coped with the Witte-Durnovo system, and it will also cope with the Cadet antidotes.

* *
*

It is either a revolution or a Cadet ministry, says *Rech* and adds: we beg to inform you that we, for our part, are not afraid of the revolution, whereas you are going to get hurt. But those who know how to take a militant stand at a fighting moment are well aware of the worth of such talk. *Novoye Vremya*,[227] an organ of the pogromites and sergeant-majors, is also well aware that Messrs. Gredeskuls give a reminder of the revolution only because they fear it like the plague. That is why *Novoye Vremya*, we believe, gives a much better exposé of the psychology and political substance of the deal which is being prepared, when it says: "Messrs. Cadets, we both have the same fear of the revolution, but we have almost exhausted our resources in the struggle against it, and you still have a thing or two left, which is why you should get on with it and not drag things out for too long." That is just what they are saying. The Cadets say: we for our part can afford to wait. But the *Novoye Vremya* gentlemen urge: come, make haste, the revolution is pressing.

The latest issue of *Novoye Vremya* says as much:

"...there will be an explosion the responsibility for which will fall not only on the present ministry, but also on the Cadet Party, which is guilty of the fact that being reluctant, for want of courage, to lose a part of its popularity among the extreme Left-wingers, it has led the Duma into a fatally drawn-out conflict and has committed a crime against the law of peaceful evolution, insisting on an immediate militant implementation of a political programme, a process which requires a very, very long time."

That's how things are: there is a bit of bargaining, a bit of scaring, and then a deal is done, for they have a common cause and a common aim.

Written on June 28 (July 11), 1906

Published on June 29, 1906 in the newspaper *Ekho* No. 7

Printed from the *Ekho* text

AMONG THE NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

The newspaper *Mysl*[228] carries an interesting "proscription list" of the Yaroslavl Administration. Dozens of persons (56 in the town of Yaroslavl and 17 in the town of Rybinsk) are marked off in it as "suspects", and a secret report requests the police department for "appropriate instructions". In this connection, *Mysl* says:

> "Let everyone pass judgement. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. He that hath reason to understand, let him understand. The police department has now conceived a grandiose operation for the simultaneous radical and "final liquidation" of a number of organisations over the entire Russian land through a massive "seizure", unprecedented in scale, of persons suspected of adherence to the Socialist-Revolutionary and Social-Democratic parties, and the peasant and the railway unions. For that purpose, the department has demanded full lists of suspected persons from the local authorities. These "proscription lists", concentrated in one place, by now contain almost ten thousand names of persons over whom arrest hangs like the sword of Damocles."

And so, the government is hatching another plot. Military preparations against the people, "measures" to dissolve the Duma, and lists containing 10,000 names for arrest! As in October-December, the government has made a "dead set" at the revolution, utilising the relative freedom to lure out and destroy thousands of more fighters for freedom.

Let one and all, therefore, be at their post. The government is prepared—the revolutionary people must also be prepared.

Written on June 29 (July 12), 1906

Published on June 30, 1906 in the newspaper *Ekho* No. 8

Printed from the *Ekho* text

THE SECOND CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE)[229]

NOVEMBER 3-7 (16-20), 1906

1

REPORT ON THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN FOR THE SECOND DUMA

NOVEMBER 4 (17)

Resolution of the St. Petersburg and Moscow Committees, Polish Social-Democrats and the Latvians[230]

1. We have had to accept a struggle on the Duma basis only through the fault of the treacherous bourgeoisie.

2. We must base the election campaign on opposition between revolutionary and "peaceful" struggle, showing the great danger of Cadet hegemony in the emancipation movement. Hence the question: is a bloc with the Cadets (agreement at the first stage) admissible?

3. At the first stage, Social-Democracy must, as a general rule, act independently; by way of exception—agreements at the first stage with the parties recognising the constituent assembly, armed uprising, etc.; at the second stage—agreements of a technical character, only for the proportional distribution of mandates. There is nothing more dangerous than to tell the masses: vote with us for the conciliators. Krushevan is dangerous not because he has a seat in the Duma, but because he is a particle of the Black-Hundred organisation supporting the government. For the sake of small separate exceptions you support Cadet hegemony, thereby upsetting the whole of our principled position (the Caucasus, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Poland refuse to have agreements). If the Black-Hundred men are returned, the Duma will simply be more violent. Why do you believe that it is not the Cadets but the Social-Democrats who are to blame for a return of the Black-Hundred men—in the event of a split in the vote?

First published in 1960 in Vol. 14 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the minutes

2

SUMMING-UP SPEECH ON THE REPORT ON THE ELECTION CAMPAIGN FOR THE SECOND DUMA

NOVEMBER 4 (17)

Agreement at elections is a bloc (you tell the masses: do ut des*). We say: we sometimes go along with the revolutionary bourgeoisie, but never with the opportunist and treacherous bourgeoisie. The election campaign will proceed between two extremes: 400 Cadets + 100 Social-Democrats (through agreement) and 200 Black-Hundred men + 250 Cadets + 20 or 50 Social-Democrats (without agreement). To put forward both an agent and a fighter is to hit out at one's own positions. The Black-Hundred men will be defeated through agreements, but then the Social-Democrats will also be defeated (morally).

First published in 1960 in Vol. 14 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the minutes

3

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE MENSHEVIK ELECTORAL PLATFORM

NOVEMBER 6 (19)

I have merely said that the platform contrasts revolutionary and peaceful methods and nothing more, the rest being unsatisfactory. Nothing is said about how the Social-Democrats differ from other groups of "working people" (Socialist-Revolutionaries), as the Social-Democratic group in the Duma does in its declaration.[231] No distinction is made between scientific and vulgar socialism.

Nothing is said about the need to distinguish between the proletariat's stand and that of the petty proprietor. The platform does not come out for a bloc, but it is a bloc, because any petty bourgeois will subscribe to it. In a plat-

* Give and take.—*Ed.*

form we cannot remain silent about the other parties, and this one says nothing about them, apart from a vague indication: "more resolute", etc.

First published in 1960 in Vol. 14 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the minutes

4

SPEECHES ON THE QUESTION OF CONVENING A "LABOUR CONGRESS"

NOVEMBER 7 (20)

1

Lenin insists that the question of a "labour congress" is a burning one and should be discussed.

2

Lenin points to the publication of letters by Plekhanov, Martov and others in the bourgeois press, and to the fact that Kostrov, for instance, failed to table in the Duma group the proposal on the demand for a Cadet ministry (which came from the C.C.), thereby committing a breach of Party discipline, and a good thing too. The agitation for a "labour congress" is used to put spokes in the wheels of our Party's activity. We have the C.C. organ, but no Central Organ, and why not? There is enough money, the C.C. organ is published regularly, but there is no organisation, and that is why there is no C.O.

First published in 1960 in Vol. 14 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the minutes

5

MINORITY OPINION ENTERED AT THE ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. ON BEHALF OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC DELEGATES OF POLAND, THE LATVIAN TERRITORY, ST. PETERSBURG, MOSCOW, THE CENTRAL INDUSTRIAL REGION AND THE VOLGA AREA

The Bund delegates have tabled a resolution at the conference which almost entirely repeats the resolution of the Bund's Seventh Congress, and which gives a historical

assessment of the Duma boycott.[232] The undersigned delegates to the conference have abstained in the voting on this resolution for the following reasons. It is wrong and impossible to separate the question of *why* we go into the Duma[233] from the question of *how* we get there. Recognition that the boycott is correct means that the basic character of all our tactics remains absolutely the same under the present participation in the election as it was during the boycott of the First Duma. To recognise that the Cadet majority of the First Duma was a hindrance to the activity of the revolutionary elements, while endorsing agreements between the Cadets and the Social-Democrats at the first stage of the elections is to have our general premises beaten by our practical policies. To recognise and support Cadet hegemony in agitation before the masses by putting up common electoral rolls only to condemn this hegemony later in a special additional resolution, is to compromise in the strongest possible way all the tactics and all the principles of revolutionary Social-Democracy. Those are the grounds on which we place before the entire R.S.D.L. Party the following minority opinion.

"The tactics of boycotting the State Duma, which helped the mass of the people to form a correct opinion of the impotence and lack of independence of that institution, found complete justification in the farcical legislative activities of the State Duma and in its dissolution.

"But the counter-revolutionary behaviour of the bourgeoisie and the compromising tactics of the Russian liberals prevented the immediate success of the boycott and compelled the proletariat to take up the struggle against the landlord and bourgeois counter-revolution also on the basis of the Duma campaign.

"The Social-Democrats must wage this struggle outside the Duma and in the Duma itself in order to develop the class-consciousness of the proletariat, to further expose to the whole people the harmfulness of constitutional illusions, and to develop the revolution.

"In view of this state of affairs, and for the purposes mentioned above, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party must take a most energetic part in the present Duma campaign.

"The principal objects of the Social-Democratic election and Duma campaigns are: firstly, to explain to the people the uselessness of the Duma as a means of satisfying the demands of the proletariat and the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie, especially the peasantry. Secondly, to explain to the people the impossibility of achieving political liberty by parliamentary methods as long as the real power remains in the hands of the tsar's government, and to explain the necessity of an armed uprising, of a provisional revolutionary government and of a constituent assembly elected by universal, direct and equal suffrage by secret ballot. Thirdly, to criticise the First Duma and reveal the bankruptcy of Russian liberalism, and especially to show how dangerous and fatal it would be for the cause of the revolution if the liberal-monarchist Cadet Party were to play the predominant and leading role in the liberation movement.

"As the class party of the proletariat, the Social-Democratic Party must remain absolutely independent throughout the election and Duma campaigns, and here, too, must under no circumstances merge its slogans or tactics with those of any other opposition or revolutionary party.

"Therefore, at the first stage of the election campaign, i.e., before the masses, it must as a general rule come out absolutely independently and put forward only its own Party candidates.

"Exceptions to this rule are permissible only in cases of extreme necessity and only in relation to parties that fully accept the main slogans of our immediate political struggle, i.e., those which recognise the necessity of an armed uprising and are fighting for a democratic republic. Such agreements, however, may only extend to the nomination of a joint list of candidates, without in any way restricting the independence of the political agitation carried on by the Social-Democrats.

"*In the workers' curia the Social-Democratic Party must come out absolutely independently and refrain from entering into agreements with any other party.*

"At the higher stages of the election, i.e., at the assemblies of electors in the towns and of delegates and electors in the countryside, partial agreements may be entered into exclusively for the purpose of distributing seats proportionately

to the number of votes cast for the parties entering the agreement. In this connection, the Social-Democratic Party distinguishes the following main types of bourgeois parties according to the consistency and determination of their democratic views: (a) the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Polish Socialist Party and similar republican parties*; (b) the Popular Socialists[235] and the Trudoviks of a similar type**; (c) the Cadets."

Proletary No. 8
November 23, 1906

Printed from the *Proletary* text

LABOUR CONGRESS AND MERGER WITH THE S.R.s

(NOTE)

As our readers will know from No. 9 of *Proletary*,[236] the Menshevik Y. Larin has come out in his pamphlet in favour of a non-Party labour congress and for a merger of the Social-Democratic Party with the S.R.s, the P.P.S. and in general with all "socialist" parties. Larin himself says that the number of members in the S.R. Party is unknown. He adds that the Socialist-Revolutionaries estimate their membership at 50,000-60,000. Saying that this could be an exaggeration, Larin believes that the S.R.s must number at least 30,000.

We do not know where Larin got his figures of 50,000-60,000, for he mentions no source. We have never come across such data in any S.R. writings. The only fully published minutes of the First Congress of the S.R. Party (December 1905) *do not contain any* data on the S.R. Party's membership. The fact is that no such data could have been available, because elections to a party congress by all the members of the party, proportional to a definite number of party members, have never been held by any party in Russia except the Social-Democrats. The Social-Democratic Party alone proclaimed this principle in November 1905 in the newspaper *Novaya Zhizn* on behalf of the Bolshe-

* Perhaps the Zionist socialists[234] also come under this category.
** Perhaps including certain Jewish democrats. We are not competent to judge of these matters without having the opinion of the Jewish Social-Democrats.

vik C.C.,[237] and the All-Russia Conference of the Bolshevik Organisations in December 1905[238] already consisted of representatives elected on the basis of one for 300 Party members. Representation on this principle was first applied to the whole Party at the Unity (Stockholm) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., with the controlling element in this case being the composition of the Organising Committee for convoking the Congress: it was made up of equal numbers of representatives from the two contending factions, the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks.

So, where Larin got his maximum of 50,000-60,000 remains an absolute mystery. However he used this figure (which is about one-third of the membership of the R.S.D.L.P.) to suggest to readers that in a merger of the two parties the Social-Democrats were fully assured of a preponderance over the S.R.s. Larin's mistake was already pointed out in a feuilleton in No. 9 of *Proletary*, which said that instead of "peace and positive work" such a merger would actually result in growing dissension, to say nothing of its being unacceptable for reasons of principle. Interesting confirmation of what we then said came from an article by Léon Remy in the French Socialist newspaper *L'Humanité*[239] on December 17, 1906. *Tribune Russe*,[240] the S.R. Party's *official* organ abroad, *quoted* Remy as saying that the "Council" of the S.R. Party "reckons the party to have about 150,000 organised members, and if the concept of membership is given a somewhat broader interpretation, such as that given to the Rules by some regional committees, the figure is 200,000".

To enable readers to judge for themselves how this curious figure was obtained, we cite *all* the district data given in Remy's article. North-west—21,000; Volga area—14,000 ("almost double the figure if all those accepting the party's programme are included"); Northern Caucasus—21,000; Transcaucasus—17,900; Centre—26,000 (including 5,000 in Moscow. It is odd that our Moscow comrades have been unable to discern these 5,000 even through a magnifying glass); North—20,000.

Here is a problem for the reader to solve: who has displayed more thoughtlessness—1) S.R.s, 2) Larin, or 3) Plekhanov and Axelrod?

The picture is hardly improved if in this matter of a merger with the S.R.s, the latter two disavow their ardent admirer Y. Larin. One need only give thought to drawing a line of distinction between the "all-Russia representatives" and the industrial workers and agricultural labourers, farm hands or journeymen and peasants, artisans or craftsmen and working men, etc.

Proletary No. 10
December 20, 1906

Printed from the *Proletary* text

REPORT AT A CONFERENCE OF THE ST. PETERSBURG ORGANISATION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. ON ELECTORAL AGREEMENTS IN ELECTIONS FOR THE SECOND DUMA[241]

JANUARY 6 (19), 1907

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

The rapporteur notes the absence in St. Petersburg of any Black-Hundred danger tales of which are being spread about by the Cadets in order to induce the electorate to vote for them. The local Social-Democrats are faced with the question of how to release the masses of the population in the capital from the ideological hegemony of the Cadets. Considerable sections of the urban poor who are semi-proletarians keep wavering between the Cadets and the Social-Democrats. The Cadets have been trying to bribe them by promising seats in the Duma in order to reinforce their influence on them. That is why it would, perhaps, be advisable to enter an agreement with the revolutionary-democratic parties and groups so as to work together to undermine the influence of the Cadets. The rapporteur believes that it is up to the practical workers in the local organisation to decide on the actual need and possibility of an agreement and also on its forms.

Proletary No. 12
December 25, 1906

Printed from the *Proletary* text

ARE THE MENSHEVIKS ENTITLED TO CONDUCT A POLICY OF SUPPORTING THE CADETS?

What determines Social-Democratic policy?

Essentially the class interests of the proletariat. Formally, the decisions of Party congresses.

Which are these decisions? First, the decisions of the Unity (Stockholm) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. Second, the decisions of the November All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P., approved by the C.C.

What does the resolution of the Stockholm Congress *instruct* us to do about the Duma?

...(point 1, a) "strive to *extend and sharpen* these conflicts (meaning the conflicts both between the government and the Duma, *and inside the Duma itself*) to limits making it possible to use them as starting-points for broad mass movements aimed at..." *etc*.

Have the Mensheviks abided by this direction of the Congress? In the matter of the presidium have they extended and sharpened the conflict between the Duma Left wing and the Cadets?

No, the Mensheviks have been committing a breach of the Congress's decision.

Furthermore, in the same resolution the Congress directed: "...that this intervention should be conducted in such a way as to make these sharpening clashes: (a) *reveal to the mass* the inconsistency of all the bourgeois parties which undertake to act as spokesmen for the people's will in the Duma, and (b) bring the *broad mass* (*the proletariat*, *the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie*) to an awareness that the Duma is *totally* useless", *etc*.

Consequently, the Mensheviks could, without risking anything at all, or abandoning absolutely legal ground—the Mensheviks were duty-bound to show the *mass*, i.e., *openly in the Duma*, that the *Cadet* presidium is a presidium of a party which has turned its back on the revolution.

What was the instruction to the Party contained in the resolution of the November All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P., which was approved by the Central Committee and adopted by the 18 Menshevik delegates?

"In its election campaign, the R.S.D.L.P., acting as an independent class party of the proletariat, sets itself the *aim*... 2) to explain to the masses that *all* hopes for a *peaceful* outcome of the struggle for power are *illusory*.

"...4) to stimulate the political *activity of the masses* and, organising *the forces of the revolution* outside *and inside* the Duma, to create conditions for transforming the latter into a strongpoint of the revolution...."

Starting from November 1906, the Mensheviks have moved so far over to the right that they at once broke their own resolution. Their first step tends to *disorganise* the "forces of the revolution" inside the Duma, *fortifying* the masses in the hope of a peaceful outcome, for a Cadet presidium elected by the entire Duma, without a protest from the Left, would be an official nation-wide *confirmation* by the Social-Democrats of the very hopes which they recognise as being "illusory".

The Cadets have openly and totally turned away from the revolution. The "forces of the revolution" are the Left, the Trudoviks, the S.R.s (the revolutionary bourgeoisie) and the Social-Democrats. To help organise, instead of disorganising, the "forces of the revolution" we are *duty-bound* to tell the masses: the Social-Democrats support a Left-wing, Trudovik presidium against the Cadets. In the event a Trudovik presidium were elected and failed to live up to democratic hopes, we should then use this to expose the democratic petty bourgeoisie before the mass, thereby strengthening the conviction that the proletariat is the only consistently democratic class.

What did the C.C. tell the Party and the people when starting the election campaign? We find that the official *electoral platform* of the R.S.D.L.P. says:

"...Citizens, the only men to elect to the Duma should be those who *not only* want Russia to be free, but strive *to help the people's revolution* to win this freedom.... The First Duma failed to do this. Its majority, led by the 'people's freedom' party, had hoped to secure freedom and and *through peaceful negotiations* with the government.... That is why it is not meek petitioners that should be elected to the Duma.... Citizens, elect revolutionary fighters who

will join you in carrying forward the great cause started in January, October and December of last year."

What fine, grand words, fitting for the proletariat! What a pity that for the Mensheviks they have turned out to be *empty* words.

In their *party* electoral platform they *condemned* the Cadet majority in the First Duma and its Cadet policies, but are now helping *artificially* to restore Cadet hegemony in the Left-wing Duma.

Novy Luch No. 3,
February 22, 1907

Printed from the
Novy Luch text

REPLY TO L. MARTOV[242]

That same issue of *Russkaya Zhizn*[243] carries Comrade L. Martov's feuilleton in which he returns to our editorial in No. 2* and, ignoring the explanation given by the group's committee on this matter, administers justice and metes out punishment.

What does Comrade Martov wish to achieve by this strange step? If he wants to challenge us to fight in this plane—in the plane of personal attacks and suspicions—he is making a big mistake. We are not going to follow him. We have a great deal too many *essential* differences over which we shall have to conduct a *principled* struggle in the group, in the press and in the Party, to allow ourselves to be pushed into the dirt road of petty scores and squabbles. Good luck, comrade, you can travel that road alone; we are not coming. We are glad to let you have the honour of putting in the last word which is, in fact, the very limit.

Novy Luch No. 7,
February 27, 1907

Printed from the
Novy Luch text

---

* See present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 156-60.—*Ed.*

THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.[244]

APRIL 30-MAY 9 (MAY 13-JUNE 1), 1907

1

SPEECH AGAINST THE PROPOSAL TO CLOSE THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE CONGRESS AGENDA[245]

MAY 1 (14)

I object most strongly against the closure of the debate. You cannot decide questions of principle mechanically by a simple vote.

First published in 1909 in the book *Londonsky syezd R.S.D.R.P.* (*sostoyavshiisya v 1907 godu*). *Polny tekst protokolov* (London Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., 1907. Full Text of the Proceedings), Central Committee publication, Paris

Printed from the text of the book

2

SPEECH IN DEFENCE OF THE NAME-TICKET VOTE METHOD[246]

MAY 2 (15)

Together with the representative of the Latvian delegation, we insist on the preservation of the name-ticket voting procedure used until today. It is the most democratic, saves time and ensures clarity. There can be no question at all of rigging. Those who propose a roll-call vote merely wish to drag things out, thereby making name-ticket voting impossible.

First published in 1909 in the book *Londonsky syezd R.S.D.R.P.* (*sostoyavshiisya v 1907 godu*). *Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Paris

Printed from the text of the book

3

SPEECHES FROM THE CHAIR OF THE SIXTH SITTING OF THE CONGRESS

MAY 3 (16)

1

I propose a vote of thanks to the representatives of the British Social-Democratic Federation for their help in arranging the Congress. (*Applause.*)

2

I propose that we discuss the order of the items: C.C. report, report by the Duma group, and attitude to bourgeois parties and the Duma.

A unanimous decision has been taken by the representatives of all groups to arrange the other items in the following order:

5) labour congress, 6) trade unions and the Party, 7) unorganised action, 8) unemployment, the crisis and the lock-outs, 9) organisational questions, 10) Stuttgart Congress, 11) work in the army, 12) miscellanea.

First published in 1909 in the book *Londonsky syezd R.S.D.R.P.* (*sostoyavshiisya v 1907 godu*). *Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Paris

Printed from the text of the book

4

OBJECTION TO LIEBER'S AMENDMENT TO THE BOLSHEVIK RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CONGRESS ON THE ATTITUDE TO BOURGEOIS PARTIES[247]

MAY 15 (28)

Lieber is wrong. This shows up the worth of Lieber's amendments. His is a schoolboy statement, and it is characteristic of his lack of principle.

First published in 1909 in the book *Londonsky syezd R.S.D.R.P.* (*sostoyavshiisya v 1907 godu*). *Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Paris

Printed from the text of the book

5

SPEECH ON DESIGNATING THE CONGRESS[248]

MAY 19 (JUNE 1)

I am surprised that the Mensheviks are afraid to call this the Fifth Congress. Do they think that our history is any sort of secret?

First published in 1909 in the book *Londonsky syezd R.S.D.R.P.* (*sostoyavshiisya v 1907 godu*). *Polny tekst protokolov*, Central Committee publication, Paris

Printed from the text of the book

ON THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT AT THE CURRENT STAGE OF THE BOURGEOIS-DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION[249]

Considering:

1) that because of the drawn-out economic crisis through which Russia is now going, and in connection with the extreme intensification of government reaction, there is a marked sharpening of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and also a deepening and extension of the peasants' struggle against the old system;

2) that this last year of the revolution has been marked by a rapid growth of the political awareness of all classes, a strengthening of the wing parties, a decline of constitutional illusions, a weakening of the "centre", i.e., the liberal parties, striving to stop the revolution by means of concessions acceptable to the Black-Hundred landowners and the autocracy;

3) that the class interests of the proletariat in the bourgeois revolution demand the creation of conditions which would open up the possibility for the broadest struggle against the propertied classes, for socialism;

4) that the only way to create these conditions is to win a democratic republic, full popular power and the minimum of social and economic demands necessary for the proletariat (8-hour working day and other demands of the Social-Democratic minimum programme);

5) that the proletariat alone is capable of carrying the democratic revolution to the end, provided that, as the only consistently revolutionary class in contemporary society, it leads the mass of peasants in a relentless struggle against the landowners' estates and the serf-owning state,

the Congress recognises:

a) that the main task of the proletariat at the current historical moment is to carry the democratic revolution in Russia forward to the end;

b) that any minimisation of this task inevitably results in the working class being transformed from the leader of the people's revolution carrying with it the mass of the democratic peasantry, into a passive participant in the revolution tailing behind the liberal bourgeoisie;

c) that while supporting the implementation of this task with all its strength, the Social-Democratic Party should never lose sight of the proletariat's independent, socialist aims.

Written between May 21 and 25 (June 3 and 7), 1907

Published on July 7, 1907 in the newspaper *Ziņa* No. 78

Printed from the newspaper text
Translated from the Latvian

NOTES TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE STUTTGART CONGRESS ON "MILITARISM AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS"[250]

Accordingly, the Congress considers it to be the duty of the working class and especially of its representatives in the parliaments, in view of the class character of bourgeois society, to use every means to struggle against and to deny appropriations for the aggressive policy of states, *and to act in such a way as to educate working-class youth in the spirit of socialism and an awareness of the brotherhood of nations.**)

. . .

*) The Russian amendment also had this provision: "in such a way that the ruling classes would not dare to use it (youth) as an instrument to consolidate their class domination against the lighting proletariat". These words were deleted by the commission not because anyone disagreed

with them in principle, but because they were regarded by the Germans as being illegal and capable of providing a pretext for the dissolution of German Social-Democratic organisations. This abridgement did not alter the essential meaning of the corresponding passage of the resolution.
. . .

In the event of a danger of war, the working class and its parliamentary representatives in the countries concerned must, relying on the support of the International Bureau, do everything they can to prevent a declaration of war, by every *means* which they consider reasonable, *and the choice of which depends on the degree of aggravation of the class struggle and the general political situation*.*)
. . .

*) The Russian amendment said that these means (to prevent war) are changed and *intensified* (sich ändern und *steigern*) depending on the aggravation of the class struggle, etc. The commission deleted "intensified", leaving only "changed".

Written in the second half of August 1907

Published in early September 1907 in the first collection of *Golos Zhizni*, St. Petersburg

Printed from the text of the collection

NOTES TO CLARA ZETKIN'S ARTICLE "INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS IN STUTTGART"[251]

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS IN STUTTGART*)

*) This article is a translation of an editorial in the German Social-Democratic fortnightly *Die Gleichheit* (Equality),[252] which is edited by Clara Zetkin and is the organ of the women's labour movement in Germany. The assessment of the Stuttgart Congress is here given with remarkable correctness and talent: clear, concise and bold propositions sum up the tremendous ideological context of the Congress debates and resolutions. For our part, we add several notes to this article to indicate to the Russian reader some facts coming from the West-European socialist press, facts largely distorted by our Cadet and semi-Cadet news-

papers (like *Tovarishch*[253]), which have told many lies about the Stuttgart Congress.

. . .

The question of relations between the Social-Democrats and the trade unions went best to show the unanimity of class-conscious proletarians of all countries. No one any longer objected in principle against the basic historical tendency of the proletarian class struggle—to connect as closely as possible the political and the economic struggle, and also organisations in both, into a single force of the socialist working class. Only the representative of the Russian Social-Democrats, Plekhanov, and the majority of the French delegation fell back on rather unsatisfactory arguments*) in an effort to justify some restrictions on this principle by referring to the special conditions prevailing in their countries.

. . .

*) The Russian Social-Democratic delegation in Stuttgart had a preliminary discussion of the questions in substance with a view to appointing its representatives to the commission. In the commission on relations between the trade unions and the socialist parties, Plekhanov did not represent all the Russian Social-Democrats, but only the Mensheviks. Plekhanov went into the commission to stand up for the principle of "*neutrality*". The Bolsheviks sent Voinov to the commission and he stood up for the *Party's view*, i.e., the decision in the spirit of the London Congress against neutrality, and for the closest contacts between the trade unions and the Party. Consequently, Clara Zetkin regarded as "unsatisfactory" the arguments *not* of the R.S.D.L.P. representative, but of the representative of the Menshevik opposition in the R.S.D.L.P.

. . .

And here, ultimately, the revolutionary energy and indomitable faith of the working class in its own fighting capacity won out, on the one hand, over the pessimistic credo of its own impotence and hidebound stand for the old and exclusively parliamentary methods of struggle, and on the other, oversimplified anti-militarist sport of the French semi-anarchists à la Hervé.*)

. . .

*) The author of the article, while contrasting the two deviations from socialism rejected by the Congress: Hervé's semi-anarchism, and opportunism, included in the "exclusively parliamentary" forms of struggle, fails to name any spokesmen of this opportunism. In the commission of the

Stuttgart Congress, on the question of militarism, the same antithesis was made by Vandervelde when he objected to the opportunist speech of Vollmar. Vollmar hints at Hervé's expulsion, said Vandervelde, but I protest against this and warn Vollmar, because the expulsion of the extreme Left-wingers would suggest the idea of expelling the extreme Right-wingers (Vollmar is one of the most "Rightist" German opportunists).

. . .

Finally, on the question of women's suffrage as well, the sharply principled class standpoint, which regards women's suffrage as nothing but an organic part of the proletariat's class right and class cause, won out over the opportunist bourgeois view which hopes to wheedle out of the ruling classes a mutilated and curtailed suffrage for women.*)

. . .

*) At the Congress in Stuttgart, this bourgeois standpoint was backed only by an Englishwoman from the Fabian Society (a quasi-socialist organisation of British intellectuals taking an extremely opportunist stand).

. . .

At the same time, the Congress—confirming the resolution of the International Women's Conference on this point—stated unequivocally that in their struggle for suffrage the socialist parties must put forward and uphold the principled demand for women's suffrage, regardless of any "considerations of convenience".*)

. . .

*) A hint at the Austrian Social-Democrats. Both at the International Socialist Women's Conference and in the Congress committee dealing with the women's question, there was a polemic between the German and the Austrian Social-Democratic women. Clara Zetkin had earlier reproached the Austrian Social-Democrats in the press for pushing into the background the demand for *women*'s suffrage in their agitation for electoral rights. The Austrians put up a very lame defence, and Victor Adler's amendment, which very cautiously conducted "Austrian opportunism" in this question, was rejected in the commission by 12 votes to 9.

Written in September and early October 1907

Published in October 1907 in the collection *Zarnitsy*, issue I, St. Petersburg

Printed from the text of the collection

ANTI-MILITARIST PROPAGANDA AND YOUNG SOCIALIST WORKERS' LEAGUES

It will be recalled that the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart discussed the question of militarism and in connection with it the question of anti-militarist propaganda. The resolution adopted on the point says, in part, that the Congress regards it as a duty of the working classes to "help to have working class youth brought up in a spirit of international brotherhood and socialism and imbued with class consciousness". The Congress regards this as an earnest of the army ceasing to be a blind instrument in the hands of the ruling classes, which they use as they see fit and which they can direct against the people at any time.

It is very hard, sometimes almost impossible, to conduct propaganda among soldiers on active service. Life in the barracks, strict supervision and rare leave make contact with the outer world extremely difficult; military discipline and the absurd spit and polish cow the soldier. Army commanders do everything they can to knock the "nonsense" out of the "brutes", to purge them of every unconventional thought and every human emotion and to instil in them a sense of blind obedience and an unthinking wild hatred for "internal" and "external" enemies.... It is much harder to make an approach to the lone, ignorant and cowed soldier who is isolated from his fellow-men and whose head has been stuffed with the wildest views on every possible subject, than to draft-age young men living with their families and friends and closely bound up with them by common interest. Everywhere anti-militarist propaganda among young workers has yielded excellent results. That is of tremendous importance. The worker who goes into the army a class-conscious Social-Democrat is a poor support for the powers that be.

There are young socialist workers' leagues in all European countries. In some, for instance, Belgium, Austria and Sweden, these leagues are large-scale organisations carrying on responsible party work. Of course, the main aim of the youth leagues is self-education and the working out of

a distinct and integrated socialist outlook. But the youth leagues also carry on practical work. They struggle for an improvement in the condition of apprentices and try to protect them from unlimited exploitation by their employers. The young socialist workers' leagues devote even more time and attention to anti-militarist propaganda.

For that purpose, they try to establish close ties with young soldiers. This is done in the following way. Before the young worker has joined the army, he is a member of a league and pays membership dues. When he becomes a soldier, the league continues to maintain constant contacts with him, regularly sending him small cash aids ("soldier's sous" as they call them in France), which, however small, are of substantial importance to the soldier. For his part, he undertakes to provide the league with regular information about everything that goes on in his barracks and to write about his impressions. Thus, even after he joins the army, the soldier does not break off his ties with the organisation of which he was a member.

An effort is always made to drive the soldier as far away from home as possible for his service. This is done with the intention of preventing the soldier from being tied with the local population by any interest, and to make him feel alien to it. It is then easier to make him carry out orders: to shoot at a crowd. Young workers' leagues try to bridge this alienation between the soldier and the local population. Youth leagues are connected with each other. When he arrives in a new town, the soldier, a former member of a youth league at home, is met by the local league as a welcome visitor, and he is at once brought into the circle of local interests and helped in every possible way. He ceases to be a new-comer and a stranger. He is also aware that if any misfortune befalls him he will receive help and support. This awareness adds to his courage, he gains assurance in his behaviour in the barracks, and is bolder in standing up for his rights and his human dignity.

Their close ties with young soldiers enable the youth leagues to carry on extensive anti-militarist propaganda among the soldiers. This is done mainly with the aid of anti-militarist literature, which the youth leagues publish and circulate in great quantities, especially in France,

Belgium and also in Switzerland, Sweden, etc. This literature is highly diverse: postcards with anti-militarist pictures, anti-militarist army songs (many of these songs are very popular among the soldiers), "soldier's catechism" (in France it was circulated in more than 100,000 copies), all sorts of pamphlets, leaflets, appeals; weekly, fortnightly and monthly newspapers and magazines for soldiers, some of them illustrated. *Barracks*, *Recruit*, *Young Soldier*, *Pju pju* (a pet name for the young recruit), and *Forward* are very widely circulated. For example, in Belgium the newspapers *Recruit* and *Barracks* have a printing of 60,000 copies each. Especially many magazines are published at the time of the draft. Special issues of soldiers' newspapers are mailed to the homes of all recruits. Anti-militarist literature is delivered to soldiers in the barracks and handed out to them in the streets; soldiers find it in coffee-houses and pubs, and everywhere else they go.

Recruits receive special attention. They are given a ceremonial send-off. During the recruitment, processions are staged in the towns. In Austria, for instance, recruits walk through the town dressed in mourning and to the strains of funeral marches. In front of them rolls a decorated red carriage. All the walls are plastered with red posters which say in large letters: "You will not shoot at the people!" Evening parties with ardent anti-militarist speeches are held in honour of the recruits. In short, everything is done to awaken the recruit's consciousness, to ensure him against the evil influence of the ideas and emotions which will be instilled into him in the barracks by fair means and foul.

The work of the socialist youth is not in vain. In Belgium, there are almost 15 soldiers' unions in the army, which are mostly affiliated with the Social-Democratic Labour Party and are closely allied with each other. In some regiments, two-thirds of the soldiers are organised. In France, the anti-militarist mood has become massive. During the strikes at Dünkirchen, Creusot, Loguivi, Monso-le-Min the soldiers ordered against the strikers declared their solidarity with the workers....

As time goes on, there are more and more Social-Democrats in the army and the troops become increasingly less reliable. When the bourgeoisie has to confront the organ-

ised working class, whom will the army back? The young socialist workers are working with all the enthusiasm and energy of the young to have the army side with the people.

Vperyod No. 16,
October 8, 1907

Printed from the
Vperyod text

HOW THE SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARIES WRITE HISTORY

In No. 5 of *Znamya Truda*,[254] the Central Organ of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, we find an editorial on the Stuttgart Congress, which is written in a torrent of words and immoderate boasting, the habitual style of the S.R.s. There is a reprint of the telegram in which the C.C. of the S.R. Party informed Europe that "the revolutionary struggle commands it to remain at its post". The selfsame C.C. voices its complete satisfaction over the "usual energy" displayed by the Socialist-Revolutionary representative in the Bureau.[255] "By its resolution, the Socialist International endorsed the view of the trade union movement which we have always supported," *Znamya Truda* assures us. Despite the dogmatist Kautsky, the Congress "turned out to be on our side" on the question of a legislative introduction of a minimum wage. Within three years, "we Russian socialists have grown into a great mass party, a fact the International has openly and respectfully (!!!) recognised".

In short, thirty thousand couriers were dispatched from Europe to pay their respects to the Socialist-Revolutionaries.

Meanwhile, the malignant Social-Democrats carried on with their "petty intrigues" in the Russian section, namely, they fought against the equality of votes for the S.D.s and the S.R.s which the Socialist-Revolutionaries demanded. The Social-Democrats demanded 11 votes for themselves, 6 for the Socialist-Revolutionaries and 3 for the trade unions. The Bureau resolved: 10 for the S.D.s, 7 for the S.R.s and 3 or the trade unions. "Adler and Bebel, who voted against our demand, declared that they had no wish at all to mini-

mise the importance of the S.R. Party, which they recognised as an important factor of Russian socialism and the revolution. But they wanted to be fair and to state the approximate balance of forces" (*Znamya Truda*).

Our Khlestakovs[256] are imprudent, oh so imprudent! There was not and *could not have been* any question in the Bureau either of the significance of the S.R.s, or of the "important factor". Once a party has been admitted to the Congress and the Bureau, the Bureau and its members will not bother to assess its significance and importance. The only thing the Bureau can assess is the *strength* of the parties for apportioning the votes. Bebel and Adler agreed with the arguments of our Social-Democratic representative in the Bureau that the S.D.s and the S.R.s are *not equal* in strength. Having agreed with these arguments, they naturally noted that they were not passing judgement either on principles or trends, that they were not deciding on the dispute between the S.D. and the S.R. programmes, but were merely weighing their strength for apportioning the votes. It is entirely in the Khlestakov spirit to interpret this self-evident reservation to mean recognition of the Socialist-Revolutionaries as "an important factor".

The S.R.s are being doubly imprudent when, in reporting from memory and distorting the meaning of Bebel and Adler's reservation, they say nothing at all about the *arguments on the substance of the case*. They give us Bebel's reservations with embellishments, but are silent on the substance of our dispute. Why is that so?

In substance, our representatives in the Bureau had the following argument. The Social-Democrat referred to the number of deputies in the Second Duma as the most precise criterion of party strength, adding that the electoral law favoured the peasants over the workers. The S.R. replied that apart from the S.R. group there were some near-S.R.s in the Duma—the Trudoviks and the Popular Socialists. A portion of them, he implied, should be added to the S.R.s! Besides, the Popular Socialists have some "first-class writers" ("écrivains de premier ordre", said Rubanovich). Those were the Socialist-Revolutionary's very words.

To this the S.D. representative replied: indeed, the Popular Socialists do have some "first-class writers" as do the

French Radical-Socialists and the Radicals,[257] say, a man like Clemenceau (also a "first-class writer"). But is it proper for an independent party to refer to *another* party as evidence of its own strength? Is it proper, when the "first-class writers" among the Popular Socialists have not the slightest intention of requesting admission to the Congress?

Is it proper, let us add, to present oneself as an ultra-revolutionary in Russia and to drag along the Popular Socialists for help in Europe?

Proletary No. 17,
October 20, 1907

Printed from the
Proletary text

THE THIRD DUMA AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

The Third Duma,[258] convened on the basis of the electoral law which was promulgated by the tsar after the dissolution of the Second Duma on June 3, 1907, opened on November 1, 1907. The old electoral law, issued on December 11, 1905,[259] was a far cry from universal, direct, and equal suffrage by secret ballot, and distorted the will of the people, turning the Duma into an ugly expression of that will—especially after the "interpretation" of the law given in the Second Duma by the Senate, consisting of old civil servants and justices entirely subservient to the tsarist autocracy. On June 3, the tsar deprived the workers, peasants and urban poor of the trifling electoral rights they had enjoyed. In this way, the autocracy committed another heinous crime against the people by forging popular representation and handing the Duma over to the landowners and capitalists, the mainstay of the tsarist autocracy and the age-old oppressors of the people. That they would dominate the Duma could have been predicted. That is exactly what happened.

At present, returns are in on the election of 439 members of the Duma. The eight non-party members aside, the other 431 belong to *four* main groups: 1) the largest—the *Right-wingers*, Black-Hundred deputies, numbering 187; 2) then the *Octobrists*[260] and parties close to them, numbering 119;

3) the Cadets and like-minded men, 93; 4) the Left-wingers, 32 (of them, 16 to 18 Social-Democrats).

Everyone knows who the Black-Hundred men are. It is true that among their adherents there is a section of ignorant, unclass-conscious workers, peasants and urban poor, but their governing core consists of feudal-minded landowners, for whom the preservation of the autocracy is the only salvation, because it alone can help them to plunder the public till, receiving grants, loans, good salaries and handouts of every sort; the autocracy with its police and army alone gives them the possibility of keeping in bondage the peasantry, which suffers from lack of land and is fettered with labour services and irredeemable debts and arrears.

The Octobrists also include landowners, mainly those who engage in large-scale sales of grain from their estates and require the patronage of the autocracy to secure lower customs tariffs on their grain abroad, to keep down the costs of transporting the grain abroad by Russian railroad and to secure the best possible prices from the treasury when it purchases the alcohol, which many landowners produce from potatoes and grain at their distilleries, for the vodka monopoly. But apart from these predatory and greedy landowners, many of the Octobrists are equally predatory and greedy capitalist manufacturers, factory-owners and bankers. They, too, are in need of the government's patronage to secure high tariffs on foreign goods, so that Russian goods could be sold at three times their price, to secure fat contracts from the treasury for the capitalist factories, etc. They want the police and the army to turn the workers into the same sort of slaves that the peasants are under the feudal-minded landowners.

Naturally, the Octobrists are very close to the Black-Hundred men. Should the Duma examine government revenue and expenditure—they will put their heads together to see that the full burden of the taxes falls on the peasants, the workers and the urban poor, while the revenues go into the pockets of the capitalists, the landowners and senior civil servants. Should the question arise of allocating land to the peasants or improving the condition of the workers—the Black-Hundred men and the Octobrists will pull together to sell, at a threefold price, only those lands which they

do not need, stripping the peasants, impoverished as they are, of everything they have; they will try very hard to fetter the hands and feet of the workers, who are already hard pressed by the burden of capitalist exploitation. And, of course, both the Black-Hundred men and the Octobrists will strain very hard to have the largest possible police and army to provide protection for their "precious" life and their "sacrosanct" property: after all, they fear the revolution like the plague, they are terrified by the prospect of a mighty drive by the workers and peasants rising to the great struggle for liberty and land. *Together the Octobrists and the Black-Hundred men will constitute a vast majority in the Third Duma: 306 out of 439 members*. This majority can do just what it wants. It is against the revolution, or, as the more common saying is, it is counter-revolutionary.

But there may be questions on which the Octobrists will differ with the majority of the Black Hundreds. The latter's effrontery knows no bounds. They are sure that the police truncheon, the whip, the machine-gun and the bayonet alone will put down any revolution, any popular urge for light and freedom. They would like to rely on the autocracy and do as they wish with the public revenue, using it for their own benefit, taking over all the lucrative posts and treating the country as their own estate. The Octobrists remember that up to now the landowners and the civil servants have run things in a way that gave them everything and left hardly enough for the capitalists. Two plunderers—a Black-Hundred man and an Octobrist—quarrel over a succulent titbit, over who is to get more. The Octobrists refuse to let the Black Hundreds have everything or even the greater share: just recently, the Japanese war gave them an object lesson, making them realise that the Black Hundreds bungled things in such a way that they inflicted losses even on themselves, to say nothing of the capitalists and the merchants. That is why the Octobrists want to take over some of the power in the state and wish to frame the constitution for their own benefit and, naturally, not for the benefit of the people. In so doing the Octobrists want to deceive the people by diverse laws which have the appearance of introducing reforms and improving things for the state and the people, but actually serve the

interests of the rich. Like the Black Hundreds, they are of course prepared to rely on the machine-gun, the bayonet and the whip against the revolution, but to be on the safe side they want to seal the eyes of the masses with the aid of fraudulent reforms.

To do all this, the Octobrists need allies other than the Black Hundreds. It is true that in these matters as well they hope to detach a section of the Right wing from the ultra-Black Hundreds of the Union of the Russian People,[261] but that is not enough. That is why they have to seek for other allies who are also hostile to the revolution, but who are enemies of the Black Hundreds, favour fraudulent or petty reforms, and support the constitution in the interests of the big and possibly a section of the middle bourgeoisie.

It is easy for the Octobrists to find such allies in the Duma: they are the Cadets, a party of that section of the landowners, the big and middle bourgeoisie which has quite adapted itself to conducting a really good capitalist economy, like that in the West-European countries, and based likewise on the exploitation and oppression of the workers, the peasants and the urban poor, but an exploitation which is clever, subtle and artful, an exploitation you do not see right through all at once. There are many landowners in the Cadet Party engaged in real capitalist operations, and similar factory-owners and bankers, many lawyers, professors and doctors with good incomes, derived from the rich. It is true that in their programme the Cadets promised the people a great many things: there was universal suffrage and all the freedoms, an 8-hour working day, and land for the peasants. But all that was said merely to attract the masses of people, for they never actually made any straightforward proposal for universal suffrage even in the first two Dumas; their bills on the freedoms were in fact aimed at giving the people as little freedom as possible; in the Second Duma they proposed a 10-hour day instead of the 8-hour day, and they were prepared to let the peasants have land which was of no use to the capitalist economy, and which carried redemption payments, and let them have so little of it that even if the peasants got it, they would still have to work for a wage on the neigh-

bouring landowners' estates. That was a clever trick to which the workers did not rise at all, very few peasants did and only some of the urban poor actually took the Cadets at their word. Today, after the dissolution of the two Dumas, the Cadets have grown very quiet and are making up to the Octobrists: they declared that they regard the revolutionaries and especially the Social-Democrats as their enemies, and, believing the Octobrists to be constitutional-minded, voted for an Octobrist to fill the post of Duma Chairman. The deal is ready. It is true that Minister Stolypin does not apparently want a permanent deal and wants to keep the Cadets in submission, thereby exerting an influence on the Octobrists, but *in practice there will still be constituted another majority in the Duma—the Octobrists and the Cadets*. Together they number 212, slightly less than half, but they will also have the non-party men behind them, and these number 8, so that the majority will be there; and even among the Rightists some might vote with the Octobrists and the Cadets on some questions. Of course, this *other majority will also be counter-revolutionary* and will fight against the revolution; it will merely cover up with trifling reforms which are of no use to the people.

Can these two majorities in the Third Duma defeat the revolution?

The great Russian revolution cannot stop until the peasants receive land in any appreciable quantity and until the masses of people secure the main influence on the administration of the state. Can we expect the two Duma majorities to produce all that? The question is in itself ridiculous: can the feudal-minded landowners and plunderous capitalists be expected to give land to the peasants and give up the supreme power to the people? No! They will throw a starving peasant a crust, after stripping him of everything he has, and they will help only the kulaks and the sharks to make themselves comfortable, taking all the power for themselves and leaving the people oppressed and subjugated.

The Social-Democrats must naturally do everything they can to continue the people's great cause—the revolution, the struggle for liberty and land.

In the Duma, the government behind the Octobrists, and the Cadets want to play a double game. The government,

FROM MARX TO MAO NOT FOR COMMERCIAL DISTRIBUTION

while stepping up its persecutions and putting down Russia with the aid of bayonet, noose, prison cell and prison camp, pretends to be an advocate of reform. The Cadets, who have actually embraced the Octobrists, pretend that they are real champions of liberty. Both want to cheat the people and stamp out the revolution.

Let us see that this does not happen! The Social-Democrats, consistent and loyal fighters for nation-wide emancipation, will unmask the hypocrites and the cheats. Inside and outside the Duma they will expose the tyrannies of the Black-Hundred landowners and the government, and the Cadet tricks. They will—they must—understand that there is now need for more than a relentless struggle against the government; the Cadets must not be given either direct or indirect support.

The Social-Democrats must above all raise their voice to expose most sternly and relentlessly the foul tsarist crime perpetrated on June 3, 1907. Let the proletariat's spokesmen in the Duma explain to the people that the Third Duma cannot serve their interests, that it cannot meet their demands and that this can be done only by a sovereign constituent assembly elected through universal, direct and equal suffrage by secret ballot.

The government will propose new laws. The Octobrists, the Cadets and the Black Hundreds will do the same. All these laws will be a brazen swindle of the people, a gross violation of their rights and interests, a mockery of their demands, a mockery of the blood shed by the people in the struggle for liberty. All these laws will provide protection for the interests of the landowners and the capitalists. Each of these laws will be a fresh link in the chains of bondage which the oppressors and the parasites want to clamp on the workers, the peasants and the urban poor. Not everyone will understand this right away. But the Social-Democrats know and understand this, and that is why they will expose this boldly before the cheated people. In so doing, they must devote special attention to the laws which relate to the people's most vital needs: the laws on land, the laws on labour, on state revenue and expenditure. In branding the violence and fraud of the feudal-minded landowners and the capitalists, the Social-Democrats must

explain their demands to the entire people: full powers for the people (a democratic republic), unrestricted liberty and equality, the 8-hour working day and the easing of working conditions for labour, confiscation of large estates and the handing of land over to the peasants. They must also point to the great goal which the proletariat of all countries sets itself—socialism, complete abolition of wage slavery.

Alongside the Social-Democrats in the Duma there is a small group of Left-wingers, mainly the Trudoviks. The Social-Democrats should urge these men to go along with them. This is especially necessary when there is occasion to direct questions to the government which is running rampant all over Russia like a wild beast. Every day, the watchdogs of tsarism—the police, the gendarmes—and the higher authorities—ministers and governors—permit themselves gross acts of violence and lawlessness. They must be exposed and branded. And it is up to the Social-Democrats to do this. But a question to the government requires the signatures of 30 members of the Duma, and the Social-Democrats will hardly number more than 18. Together with the other Left-wingers they are 32. The Social-Democrats must draw up the questions and urge the Left-wingers to join them. If the Leftists really cherish the great cause of liberty, they must do so. A heavy blow will then be inflicted on the government, like those the Social-Democrats inflicted on it with their questions in the Second Duma.

Such are the main tasks of the Social-Democrats in the Third Duma. Our comrades have some hard work to do. They will be there among enemies, malicious and ruthless. Efforts will be made to stop their mouths, and they will be showered with abuse, they will perhaps be expelled from the Duma, brought to trial, thrown into prison and exiled. They must be firm, in spite of all persecutions, they must hold high the proletariat's red banner and remain loyal to the end to the great cause of struggle for the people's emancipation. And all of us, comrades workers, must join forces in supporting them; we must lend a sensitive ear to their every word, respond to it, discuss their acts at meetings and rallies, reinforcing by our sympathies and approval their every correct step, helping them with all our strength

and resources in the struggle for the cause of the revolution. Let the working class be united in supporting its spokesmen, and in so doing may it strengthen its unity which it needs in the great struggle—the time when the "last decisive battle" is fought.

Vperyod No. 18,
November 1907

Printed from the
Vperyod text

PLENARY MEETING OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE[262]

AUGUST 11-13 (24-26), 1908

1

STATEMENT ON THE CONVOCATION OF THE C.C. PLENARY MEETING

Statement:

In view of the fact that attempts are being made to obscure the initial point of the incident under discussion, I categorically declare that at the outset I made a very definite statement of the following:

According to Grigory's communication, Ezra wrote to him that *the minor brother denies the Existenzrecht* of the plenary C. C.* It is this communication which has been entirely confirmed by Grigory, and not clearly refuted by Ezra, that constitutes the *illegality* of the act by the Mensheviks and the illegality of discussing *such* questions by the Bund Central Committee. I insist, therefore, on a search for the text of the letter itself.

Lenin

Motioned on August 12 (25), 1908

First published in 1933
in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from
the original

* The right to exist—*Ed.*

2

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE INCIDENT OVER THE CONVOCATION OF THE C.C. PLENARY MEETING

The C.C authorises the C.C. Bureau Abroad[263] to draw up a detailed report of the so-called incident over the convocation of the C.C. Plenary Meeting, Ezra's letters, Pyotr's statements and all the debates, and have this report preserved in the archives of the Central Committee, leaving it to the narrow C.C. to publish the report whenever the need arises.

Motioned on August 13 (26), 1908

First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from the original

3

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THIS ORGANISATION OF THE CENTRAL BUREAU ABROAD

1) Social-Democratic groups abroad shall be recognised as R.S.D.L.P. promotion groups.

2) The C.C. shall appoint a new Central Bureau Abroad consisting of 10 persons. In the absence of the C.C. Plenary Meeting, co-optation or substitution shall take place only with the approval of the C.C. Bureau Abroad.

3) The C.B.A. shall cater for the needs of the promotion groups abroad and fulfil general Party assignments from the C.C. Bureau Abroad.

4) The Bureau Abroad shall include one member of the C.C. (by appointment of a Plenary Meeting or the Bureau Abroad) with the right of veto.

5) A congress of all available promotion groups abroad shall be organised as soon as possible under the control of the C.C. Bureau Abroad.

6) The standing rules of the congress shall be approved by the C.C. Bureau Abroad

7) The C.C. Bureau Abroad is authorised to take all steps to make the congress an occasion for unifying all non-Russian Social-Democratic groups abroad into integrated local R.S.D.L.P. promotion groups. The C.C. Bureau

Abroad shall contact all the Central Committees of non-Russian Social-Democratic organisations on this question.

8) The groups shall pay 85-90 per cent of their receipts into the C.C. fund. The right to grant exemption in case of dire necessity (for instance, expenditures on émigrés) shall belong to the C.C. Bureau Abroad.

Motioned on August 13 (26), 1908

First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from the original

THE FIFTH ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.[264]

DECEMBER 21-27, 1908 (JANUARY 3-9, 1909)

1

OUTLINE OF SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF ORGANISATION[265]

I.

Composition (12 *a p o s t l e s*
5 [in]violable
(belonging to angelic order)[266])

II. (A)

1. Strike movement and revolutionary onset;
2. Reformism and revolution;
3. Tasks of fighting nationalism;
—raise before the congress;
4. How to work in legal societies.

III. (B)

(1) Duma group.
(2) Legal newspapers.
(3) Legal societies.
(4) Illegal agitators and their secret slogans.

IV. (C)

Resolutions and their popularisation....

V. (D)

Confidential agents and their promotion.

Written on December 24, 1908 (January 6, 1909)

First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from the original

2

EXPLANATION TO SPEECH ON THE QUESTION OF ORGANISATION[267]

Statement of Fact

I declare that in my speech on the organisational question, which alone was discussed today, I did *not* say nor did I intend to say a *single word* either about the attitude of the Caucasians to *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata*[268] or about "*Golos Sotsial-Demokrata*" *in general*. That is why by starting his speech with a statement that on *this* question there were now no differences between the Caucasians and *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata*, Comrade Pyotr of Tiflis had no reason at all to mention my name. As for the earlier debates, I merely spoke of the differences between *some* members of the *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* Editorial Board and the Caucasians, which were revealed at the August Plenary Meeting of the C.C. in 1908.

N. Lenin

Motioned on December 24, 1908
(January 6, 1909)

First published in 1933
in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from
the original

3

PROPOSAL ON PROCEDURE FOR VOTING RESOLUTIONS

If there is no demand for a vote on any of the resolutions tabled by someone at the conference, the conference shall vote on the resolution concerning the direction of the committee's work.

If there is a preliminary demand for a vote on someone's resolution as a basis right away, the demand shall be immediately complied with.

N. Lenin

Motioned on December 24, 1908
(January 6, 1909)

First published in 1933
in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from
the original

4

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PUBLICATION OF CONFERENCE DECISIONS

The conference requests the C.C. to take steps to publish the conference resolutions and tabled drafts, and if possible, its minutes or a brief report as well.

Motioned on December 26, 1908
(January 8, 1909)

First published in 1933
in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from
the original

5

STATEMENT OF FACT[269]

I declare that I objected to Comrade Lyadov from the standpoint, which I repeatedly emphasised in my speech, that the C.C. has an *unquestionable* right of *veto*.

N. Lenin

Motioned on December 26, 1908
(January 8, 1909)

First published in 1933
in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from
the original

6

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE MENSHEVIK DRAFT ON LIQUIDATING THE C.C.[270]

Statement of Fact

The letter of Comrades Martynov and Igorev, which they had promised to place before the C.C. but have failed to do over a period of four months, did not deal with the way the C.C. was to function but with its "right to exist" (Existenzrecht), i.e., it dealt specifically with the liquidationist plans.

N. Lenin

Motioned on December 26, 1908
(January 8, 1909)

First published in 1933
in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from
the original

PLAN FOR LECTURES ON MARXISM[271]

Marxism	*The Agrarian Question*
(α) Theory of surplus value (Mehrwert).	(α) Commodity production in agriculture.
(β) Economic development.	(β) Small-scale vs. large-scale production.
(γ) Class struggle.	(γ) Wage labour.
(δ) Philosophical materialism.	(δ) Rent.

(α) 1. Earlier socialists: "unjust", etc. A symptom of emotion instead of understanding.
2. "Labour principle" (in Russia).
3. Commodity production.
4. Capitalism. Theory of *Mehrwert*.

(β) 1. Economic development. Industry (1907).
2. Russian handicraftsmen.
3. Agriculture.
4. Railways and trusts.
5. Finance capital.
6. Socialisation of production. Socialised *labour* and individual *appropriation*.

(γ) 1. The proletariat and its cohesion (serf peasant—pauper—proletarian).
2. Separate strikes. "Wrecking" of machines.
3. Trade unions and the movement.
4. Political struggle:
   Britain—Liberals
   France—Radicals (Republicans)
   Germany—Liberals (1860s) and opportunists.
5. Revolutionary aims of the working class: expropriation of the capitalists.
6. Revolutionary struggle and struggle for reforms.

(δ) Philosophical materialism.
1. Marx's theory—integrated world outlook.
2. Two main world outlooks and philosophical starting-points: religious obscurantism and materialism.
3. Engels (Ludwig Feuerbach).

4. 1789 France—Hegel and Feuerbach in Germany (before 1848).
5. Dialectical materialism.
6. Russia: Chernyshevsky
   Narodniks
   present-day opportunists (Bogdanov).

Written in 1908 or 1909
First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*
Printed from the original

CONFERENCE OF THE ENLARGED EDITORIAL BOARD OF "PROLETARY"[272]

JUNE 8-17 (21-30), 1909

1

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON AGITATION FOR A BOLSHEVIK CONGRESS OR A BOLSHEVIK CONFERENCE SEPARATE FROM THE PARTY

JUNE 8 (21)

1

It is said, on the one hand, that there are no differences of principle, and there is a refusal to make open statements, and on the other, there is talk of basic differences in the Bolshevik faction. Isn't that duplicity? At the general Party conference Dan said: Doesn't everyone know that Lenin is being accused of Menshevism? I replied: Read *Proletary* and judge on that basis, instead of collecting gossip. At the time, Maximov was silent. Nothing is worse than the absence of open struggle. I say: Our unity based on principle has been disrupted, you say something else, and yet you call Lenin Martov.... Why is the present meeting illegal in Party terms? Members of the Bolshevik Centre elected at the Congress are talking about how best to conduct Bolshevik views. What is so inadmissible about that? In agitating for a special Bolshevik congress you show that you have lost all faith in the Party principle. We have

always stood for the Party principle, ever since the Second Congress, and are now continuing the same line, while you are preaching a split at the grass roots. There is also a pro-Party trend among the Mensheviks. We believe in the Party principle and stand up for it.

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"* (Minutes of the *Proletary* Enlarged Editorial Board Conference)

Printed from the text of the book verified with the minutes

2

Maximov says that there has been no agitation for a congress. Lyadov, Stanislav, and Vsevolod have spoken out with sufficient clarity. Since May 1908, Lyadov and Stanislav have been agitating in Russia. We have Stanislav's resolution, which says clearly enough what he wants.[273] This is a mockery of our faction. The Mensheviks have an orthodox-Marxist, Plekhanovite, trend and the Bolsheviks also have an orthodox-Marxist trend. Both the Mensheviks and we have the Valentinov-Maximov liquidationist trend, etc. Concerning Comrade Maximov's statement, I repeat that what I said was in *reply* to Maximov's words: "a fully Leninist-Plekhanovite faction is crystallising".

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the original

2

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF OTZOVISM AND ULTIMATUMISM[274]

JUNE 9 (22)

I want to deal with the "idea of the centre". Maximov has mixed things up over the Kotka conference[275]; this is how it was: if the Poles were in favour of a boycott and my vote were decisive, I declared that in that case I preferred to vote with the Bolsheviks. That was the condition I put in respect of the Poles. At that time, the whole Bolshevik Centre was against the boycott. The faction, however, was for the boycott, but there was no split, because

there was no group which wanted one. A year later, the faction turned out to be on our side. There are some "Bolsheviks" who are afraid of hitting out at the otzovists and of siding with the Mensheviks. At the conference I joined with the Mensheviks against the otzovists. That is what you think about the centre.

The story of the split as related by Maximov is a curious one. Maximov's papers say nothing about the centre but Mikha's letter has now been authenticated. The letter said that Lenin was conducting a Right-wing Bundist line. That is in the documents. Mikha wrote what Maximov is now saying. There is your idea of the centre. We got this letter from our Caucasian friends, who handed their mandate over to the Rightist Ilyich. Mikha conducted this policy in July 1908 with the participation of the group. Maximov says that we shall confer with Plekhanov. Of course, we shall, as we shall with Dan, and Martov in the C.O.[276] It took a fierce struggle at the conference to get the otzovists to be loyal. We confronted them with ultimatums. When Axelrod read the point about military-combat tasks, he said: "It is not hard to work with such 'Bolsheviks'." We shall not let the otzovists into the Duma commissions, where we were with Dan. Indeed! We shall confer with Plekhanov, as we shall with Dan and Martov. You can say as much in the press.

In the C.C. I confer with Marat. You, Marat, are a member of the faction of-divine otzovists. I am not talking about good intentions but about the political line. I ask you, comrades, to give thought to what is being said about Plekhanov. When Plekhanov speaks of his mistake in respect of the trade unions, we are reproached for failing to repulse him. When he is prepared to sacrifice his mistake, the question is whether we are attracting him by the article against Lunacharsky or whether you are repulsing the minority of the pro-Party Mensheviks[277] and the orthodox-Marxist Mensheviks for the sake of Bogdanov-Lunacharsky anti-Marxist propaganda. We have not made a deal with Plekhanov against Lunacharsky, but we can tell you who is flirting with whom. When Plekhanov kicks out Potresov, I am prepared to give him my hand. This is not a new centre, but a new caricatured Bolshevism. We are having

a replay of the old Rosa Luxemburg story.[278] But the replay here is caricatured, and "Bolshevism" must be safeguarded from it.

"Bolshevism" must now become strictly Marxist.

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the text of the book verified with the minutes

3

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE PARTY SCHOOL ON CAPRI[279]

JUNE 10 (23)

I am surprised that we are not yet bored with all this. Comrade Maximov has no reason to be excited, because there has never been a single split without extreme accusations, and split incidents have always been confused with matters of honour. I remember the scenes with Krichevsky in 1901, with Martov in 1905, and with Plekhanov in 1907—and all of them attacked me with cries about honour. It is not a question of honour, but of the fact that in the process of struggle men tend to disorganise their faction and organise a new one. Take Lyadov as an example. He has not become a bad comrade, but he is disorganising our faction and trying to set up a new one. I think that Maximov is disorganising those whom he believes to be Mensheviks. He has a perfect right to do that, but he keeps telling us about Lenin's being invited to the school. The question of control is a ridiculous one too. We can't have that. It is clear that the school is a new centre, a new trend. Marat says that he will not abandon his posts. You, Comrade Marat, have succumbed to the factional fervour which is determined by the political struggle of the "divine" otzovists.

What is a faction? It is an alliance of like-minded persons within a party. In the Duma, the party is an alliance of like-minded men inside the Duma. After all, when a member of the Duma, like Khomyakov, goes over to another party he does not cease to be its chairman. The same applies

to a faction in the party. The party alone can relieve you of the post which you have taken up on behalf of the party, We are now quarrelling—it is because we have no alliance of like-minded men. No one is encroaching on your Party post and there is no point in bringing it in. We do not have a split in the Party, but in the faction. The writ of our conference does not run to Party posts. And honour has nothing to do with all this. For my part, I am used to that sort of thing: this is the fourth time I am being abused. We must recognise what there is: two centres, two trends and the school as a fact. And when we group out, everything will be much clearer.

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the text of the book verified with the minutes

4

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE FACTION'S UNITY

JUNE 12 (25)

I am not going to reply to Maximov; everyone is arriving at the conclusion that this is our last joint sitting with him. We should, therefore refrain from exchanging abuse at the last moment. That is undignified. Marat says that he is being invited to kick himself out. When Marat declared that he preferred to work with the anti-otzovists rather than with the otzovists, his declaration was met with cries of "Bravo!" No one accused him of setting up the break-away centre at Capri, his statement on god-building was quite definite. He is wrong in formal terms. For our part we did not take the division beyond the point where the separate centres of like-minded partisans had already taken shape.

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the text of the book verified with the minutes

5

FIRST SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF BOLSHEVIK TASKS RELATING TO DUMA ACTIVITY

JUNE 12 (25)

Vishnevsky's report is the first positive contribution we have heard here.

As for the failure to send a delegate to the general Party conference, Vishnevsky seems to be making a mistake. Poletayev said that the deputies would arrive if Dan sent a telegram. Dan refused to do so. The conference has suffered greatly because of the absence of the delegate.[280]

You say that the well-informed persons[281] should not be expelled. The way to fight them is through publicity. More information should be given about them. They should be grouped and characterised.

The question of the *Proletary* Editorial Board's secretary attached to the Duma group. The secretary was not equal to his task and wrote in a highly formal manner; Steklov is not the man for this job; there is need for a man to do the spadework. The information should be as circumstantial as possible, otherwise all the promotion groups will be quite useless.

The Paris promotion group[282] is a delicate matter. We shall support Plekhanov's line; the other Mensheviks take a very nervous attitude to this. A rapprochement with the Mensheviks of the Dan type is hard. How is a group to be formed? The Mensheviks will get a crowd in. Nothing except a fight can be the result. Perhaps, in order to avoid a squabble the group should be set up under the C.O.

Nothing can be done in the Duma group without well-informed persons from the Bolsheviks. For this we should legalise two or three men. One suggestion is Vadim, and perhaps Kamenev.

Concerning the participation of local organisations in the activity of the Duma group. Broad leaflet agitation should be started. Definite specimen leaflets about Duma activity should be issued. The revolutionary Social-Democratic use of the Duma will be neither revolutionary nor Social-Democratic without the influence of the organisa-

tions. There is need of *leaflets on the subjects of the Duma speeches*. This kind of thing will involve the organisations in the work and give them an impetus. Up to now, insufficient use has been made of deputies' meetings. They wasted most of their time on debates with the otzovists. There is also need for *leaflets on the party grouping in the Duma* and, finally, *leaflets on the work of the Duma in general*. It is not only the C.C. representatives, but also the organisations that should direct the Duma group. We must have *leaflets on the meaning of this or that speech in the Duma*. Take the question of foreign policy. Our deputies were the only ones to speak. This was not properly assessed. There is need for *leaflets with extracts from speeches*. I see no other way for the organisations' participation except in the form of leaflets. The disorganisation is desperate, the leaflet activity should be pressed forward vigorously. Criticism in foreign newspapers is late. Parliamentary speeches will always say less than everything. The i's will be dotted by the leaflets.

It is sometimes very hard for the organisations to send their representatives.

As for the newspaper, there is only one condition: a majority secured for us, but I do not believe it is possible to realise such a paper.[283]

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the text of the book verified with the minutes

6

ADDENDUM TO THE RESOLUTION "ON THE ATTITUDE TO DUMA ACTIVITY AMONG THE OTHER BRANCHES OF PARTY WORK"[284]

Considerably more attention, initiative and effort should be devoted to the use of legal possibilities (a sphere in which some successes have already been scored) than has been done until now.

Written between June 13 and 15 (26 and 28), 1909

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the original

7

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF THE PARTY PRESS

JUNE 15 (28)

It is, of course, impossible to destroy *Proletary*. There is need for a popular organ, but the question depends on various other combinations, for instance, finance. It is not right to prohibit assistance for the legal press in such resolute terms as Vlasov has done. I think it would be useful to publish a small magazine, about the size of, say *Dal*,[285] which the Menshevik liquidators are publishing.

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the text of the book verified with the minutes

8

SPEECH IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF PUBLISHING PHILOSOPHICAL ARTICLES IN THE CENTRAL ORGAN

JUNE 15 (28)

Since we cannot foresee how the debate on philosophy will develop, the question should not be posed as Comrade Marat has done. Therefore all restrictions on the C.O. in this respect should be lifted. I welcome Comrade Marat's statement on the need of philosophical articles in the legal miscellanies.

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the text of the book verified with the minutes

9

PROPOSAL ON THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR A NEWSPAPER OF THE DUMA GROUP[286]

JUNE 16 (29)

In view of the importance of Comrade Meshkovsky's statement, I propose that of the 1,500 rubles earmarked or legal publishing, 1,000 should be used for the Duma newspaper.

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the text of the book verified with the minutes

10

SPEECHES AND PROPOSALS IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF REORGANISING THE BOLSHEVIK CENTRE

JUNE 17 (30)

1

I agree with Meshkovsky. A referendum concerns all Party members, and that is impossible to put through. Conferences are desirable, but they should not be made statutory. I believe that the idea of periodical conferences should alone be adopted.

2

It should be written that the Russian members of the Bolshevik Centre constitute a collegium in general, without limiting their number to three.

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the text of the book verified with the minutes

3

In the absence of a Plenary Meeting, the Executive Commission may replace the *Proletary* editors and members of the Economic Commission in the event of their leaving.

4

The Bolshevik Centre Secretariat Abroad, consisting of two persons, shall be appointed by a Plenary Meeting.

First published in 1934 in the book *Protokoly soveshchania rasshirennoi redaktsii "Proletaria"*

Printed from the original

PLAN FOR A LECTURE "THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS IN COPENHAGEN AND ITS IMPORTANCE"

1. International capital, its international organisation, international character of the working-class movement.

"Proletarians of *all* countries, unit"

2. First International
   1864-1872.
3. Second International
   1889—First Congress in Paris[287]
   1910—Eighth Congress in Copenhagen[288]
   [33 nations; almost 1,000 delegates].

4. Importance of international congresses in rallying the working class and determining its line: Amsterdam.

5. The Copenhagen Congress: Czechs and Austrians [nationalism and internationalism, bourgeois and proletarian policy].

6. *Co-operatives*
   (Weapon in the proletarian struggle: standpoint
   (A) proletarian and bourgeois
   (B) importance of co-operatives in implementing socialism: *expropriation*
   (C) behaviour of socialists in co-operatives).

7. *Support of the revolutionary* movement in *Persia*—protest against the *Finnish* campaign.

Written before September 13 (26), 1910

First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from the original

1911 – 1914

PLAN FOR A LECTURE IN A COURSE ON "FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY"

LECTURE IV

1. The essence of the capitalist mode of production as compared with the other modes of production historically preceding it.
2. Similarity in the existence of class oppression and distinction in the forms and conditions of the class struggle.
3. The worker's struggle against the capitalist over working hours. Conditions for the sale of the commodity "labour-power". The production of absolute and relative surplus-value.
4. "Normal" conditions for the consumption of the commodity "labour-power" are determined by the worker's struggle against the capitalist.
5. The strike struggle, trade unions and factory legislation in the history of the struggle for shorter working hours.
6. Some results of the half-century of modern history (14th-20th centuries) in the struggle for shorter working hours. Kautsky's "summary".[289] Insignificance of "social progress".

Written before January 27 (February 9), 1911

Published in Paris in 1911 as a duplicated leaflet issued by the Organising Commission of the Social Science Courses

Printed from the leaflet text

MEETING OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS[290]

MAY 28-JUNE 4 (JUNE 10-17), 1911

1

REPORT ON THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN THE PARTY[291]

Following the C.C. Plenary Meeting in January 1910[292] the Bolsheviks bent every effort to restore the composition of the C.C. and help it to resume its activity. C.C. members Makar and Innokenty contacted local Party organisations and Party members working in the open labour movement, together with them nominated candidates for co-optation to the C.C., etc. But the efforts of the C.C. Bolsheviks ended in the arrest of both. They got no help at all from the *Golos* people in their work in Russia. The representatives of the Mensheviks, elected at the London Congress, Mikhail, Yuri and Roman, who have now gone over to the independent legalists, have not only refused to work in the C.C., but have announced that they consider its very existence harmful to the labour movement.

In 1910, following a break of several months, Comrade Makar, who escaped from exile, and Comrade Vyazemsky once again set up a bureau for convening the C.C.* The Bundist Yudin, a member of the Bureau, took part in their work. Over a period of six months, they once again established contacts with local organisations, nominated candidates for the C.C., dispatched agents, and joined the Duma group in organising the election campaign for the by-elections in Moscow.

Of the representatives of the Mensheviks, they succeeded in contacting only Comrade Kostrov, who once or twice came merely to exercise his right to vote in the event it came to a convocation of the C.C.

After working for six months, the C.C. Bolsheviks were arrested together with several candidates for co-optation to the C.C., the comrade secretary and a number of other

* This provisional bureau was recognised both by non-Russian organisations and by our Party's C.C. Bureau Abroad and C.O.

persons variously connected with the Bureau's activity. In a letter sent from prison after their arrest, the comrades C.C. members stated that the gendarmes had kept them under constant surveillance for a number of months and had been informed of their every step, and that there was no doubt at all about the provocation over the preparations for convening the C.C. in Russia. Following the arrest of two members of the Bureau (Makar and Vyazemsky), the C.C. members still at large—Yudin and Kostrov—displayed *no activity* at all over a period of two and a half months, even failing to send any letters either to the C.C. Bureau Abroad or to the C.O.

As a result of the 18-month effort to restore the C.C. in Russia, the four Bolshevik members (Meshkovsky, Innokenty, Makar and Vyazemsky) are either in exile or in prison. The gendarme inquiries and a whole number of arrests have made it quite clear that the authorities are most thoroughly informed about *all* the London candidates[293] and C.C. members and that their every step is being watched. In view of all these circumstances to make a fresh attempt to convene the C.C. in Russia would be to court certain failure without any hope of success.

The only possible way out of this situation would be to call a Plenary Meeting abroad. Nine persons with the right to take part in the Plenary Meeting are abroad.[294] This will constitute more than one-half of its full membership (15 persons). They juridically can and essentially must declare themselves to be the Plenary Meeting.

The proposal to postpone the constitution of the Plenary Meeting until the convocation of the other members would mean many more months of delay.

With the exception of Mikhail, Yuri and Roman, who have openly announced their break with the C.C. and their sympathies for liquidating the Party, the Mensheviks could "bring together" Kostrov and Pyotr. The Bolsheviks could bring together Meshkovsky, Innokenty, Rozhkov and Sammer. It is hard to say how many months this would take.

In the light of the experience it has had, the real meaning for the Party of this protracted "work of bringing together" formal candidates is nil. It is even worse than nil, for the

game of allocating places in central bodies hides from local organisations and groups the sad reality in respect of which vigorous action must be taken. After eighteen months of unsuccessful attempts to restore the activity of the C.C., to feed the Party with more endless delays would be an affront to the Party. We do not intend to have a hand in any such affront.

At present the *real* position of the Party is such that almost everywhere in the localities there are small Party workers' groups and cells that meet irregularly. They enjoy great prestige among the workers everywhere. Everywhere they are combating liquidator-legalists in the unions, clubs, etc. They are not yet connected with each other. Their supplies of literature are extremely rare. In these groups of workers, there is a rallying together of Bolsheviks, pro-Party Mensheviks and some of the *Vperyod* supporters[295] who have not been drawn into the separate *Vperyod* faction set up abroad.

The *Vperyod* group used all the period since the Plenary Meeting to help from abroad in strengthening and separating its faction in organisational terms. Its representatives have withdrawn from the *Diskussionny Listok* Editorial Board[296] and the School Commission under the C.C.[297] The *Vperyod* group has failed to carry out the decisions of the last Plenary Meeting, and has, in fact, done everything to hamper the Social-Democratic general Party work. Preparations for the forthcoming elections have long since been started in the legal and illegal Party literature. Meanwhile, the *Vperyod* group, far from assisting the Party in this extremely important political action, has even failed to state unequivocally whether in general it favours participation in the elections to the Fourth Duma[298] or opposes participation in them. Even in their latest statements in the press, the *Vperyod* group leaders abroad continue to flirt with the otzovists.

A far more serious anti-Party and anti-Social-Democratic force is the faction of the *independent legalists* (*Nasha Zarya*,[299] *Dyelo Zhizni*,[300] and the *Golos* people who, like Dan, Martov & Co., cover them up). It has been proved beyond doubt that they recognise no Central Committee and publicly ridicule Central Committee decisions. *They cannot* and

will not carry out the last Plenary Meeting's decisions ("Not to minimise the role of an illegal party", etc.). They cannot help taking the *opposite* line of action.

No Social-Democrat can doubt that the "independent legalists" can be expected to conduct an election campaign for the Fourth Duma on their own, *apart from and against* the Party.

The task of the Social-Democratic Party members is clear: the Party workers' circles in Russia should be openly and resolutely urged to start preparations for the elections immediately. *Only* committed Party men, only comrades realising the danger of the liquidationist trend should be nominated as Social-Democratic candidates. *Direct* action against independent legalists must not be postponed for a single day; the workers must be warned right away of the danger posed to the Social-Democratic Party by the independent legalists at the elections.

Such is the task of the day for our Party. Any deviation from such an approach to the question, which has been posed by life itself (and by the independent legalists), all delays, or attempts by the legalists to repeat the game of "promises" and "assurances" are fraught with great danger to the Party.

Our practical conclusion: the meeting of the nine must absolutely and immediately issue a manifesto to the Party in which the failure to convene the Central Committee in Russia is truthfully and fully described, and which calls upon local Party circles to display initiative and establish local and regional committees, to set up and support a Central Organising Commission, to set up and support Social-Democratic press organs (where, as in *Zvezda*,[301] which is being published with the participation and support of the Social Democratic Duma group, there should be no place for the liquidators), urging them to conduct a determined and implacable struggle against the independent legalists and to make for closer ties in their work between representatives of the true Party elements, without regard for trend. In the event that not only five of the nine members of the C.C., but a solid majority of the nine agree to regard themselves as a Plenum of the C.C., this meeting of the C.C. must immediately co-opt new members, set up an Organis-

ing Commission for calling a conference and start practical preparations for election to the Fourth Duma. Representatives of pro-Party Mensheviks should be seated on the Organising Commission and the C.C. right away. The C.C. meeting must at once start a resolute struggle against the independent legalist group. It stands to reason that this struggle is incompatible with the participation of independent legalists in central Party bodies, which they have sabotaged, obstructed, weakened and kept in a morbid state for eighteen months.

Written between May 19 and 23 (June 1 and 5), 1911

First published in 1961 in Vol. 20 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from a copy written in F. E. Dzerzhinsky's hand

2

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CONSTITUTING THE MEETING

MAY 28 (JUNE 10)

1[302]

Considering that the Party has been suffering from the postponement of the Plenum for 18 months, the non-Russian organisations should have long since elected their representatives. The Latvian comrade's approach was different from that of the Bundist. He said that although he had not been elected, in view of the conditions of the Plenary Meeting's convocation he deemed it his duty to take part in it, and to submit a subsequent report to the C.C. of the Latvian Territory, with the proviso that the decisions would enter into force in the Latvian Territory only upon their approval by the C.C. of the Latvian Territory.

2

In fact, comrades here are being fooled.[303] We know that Makar and Lindov did something, contacted organisations, appointed agents and contacted the candidate. They were arrested. Since then we have had no news from any of those

who remained. They have even failed to inform either the C.O. or the C.C. Bureau Abroad. No work has been done. It is no longer possible to deceive the Party with a Russia Bureau[304] or a Russia C.C. Convening the C.C. in Russia is a phrase that helps Stolypin.

Ionov's statement says that he will send his invitation to the Bund C.C.[305] When is he going to do so? How much time has elapsed? Why is there no reply? Ionov says that not having the powers he cannot attend a meeting of the C.C. members. Why then is Lieber here? I propose a resolution on Ionov's reply, because it makes clear that an intrigue is being carried on.

3

Let us sum up what has been said about the Bureau. It turns out that the remaining members of the Bureau were meant. About the work it is said that no work has been done. Comrade Adrianov is a prominent Menshevik and the Mensheviks would have been aware of his work if he had done any. Even his closest associates know nothing about it. Any further attempt to play up the existence of a bureau somewhere is to deceive the Party. In view of the arrests, Ber could not contact the Bund C.C. What then is the Party to do? It cannot afford to wait. There must be initiative in this case.

4

Ber is shouting about the law, but at the same time he has been resolutely fighting in the C.C. Bureau Abroad against the law and in favour of the liquidators.[306] This kind of behaviour makes me doubt the sincerity of his statements and expect him to make fresh attempts to break up all-Party institutions.

First published in 1961 in Vol. 20 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the minutes

3

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE QUESTION OF CONVENING A C.C. PLENARY MEETING

MAY 30 (JUNE 12)

1[307]

I state that for six months the lower institution (C.C. Bureau Abroad) has been violating decisions and refusing to convene the higher institution. I am forced to state this in order to give a warning against putting any trust in an institution which for six months now has been trying to close the Party's way to a resumption of its central institution.

2

I point out that as early as the spring of 1910 we had a letter from Inok saying that C.C. members were being shadowed. We fought with every means against the Russian gamble.[308] Makar resumed the business in 1910 and the dispatch of money right away revealed the hopelessness of the attempt. It was quite plain at once that to call the C.C. in Russia meant to send people to gaol. From the spring of 1908 to the 1910 Plenary Meeting the C.C. did not meet in Russia a single time. The history of the convocation in Russia shows that the task is unfeasible. Sending the C.C. to Russia was tantamount to sending it to prison.

3[309]

Over a period of 18 months, four Bolsheviks have been arrested while doing central work. Not a single Menshevik has been arrested because they have been working to set up a Stolypin party. Letters were not written to us and correspondence was suspended for reasons of secrecy. The Mensheviks, far from working to set up the C.C., even refused to attend for co-optation (Mikhail, Roman and Yuri), Pyotr has been nowhere near the Bureau, while Kostrov lived close by. It is an incontrovertible fact that only the Bolsheviks have been working.

Concerning Lyubich we have a letter from Inok indicating his consent to work. Concerning Pyotr we merely have the information that he has been nowhere near the Bureau. A C.C. member has the clear duty of going to work on the C.C. Martynov is an émigré = Bogdanov, Nikita. If he is invited, then they and Victor should be invited too. Mikhail, Yuri and Roman have nothing to do with the C.C. These are men who are building a Stolypin labour party and are engaged in activity which was resolutely condemned by the January Plenary Meeting. We have nothing in common with the architects of a Stolypin labour party or with those who are helping them.

First published in 1961 in Vol. 20 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the minutes

4

PROPOSAL FOR RESOLUTION ON CONVENING A PARTY CONFERENCE

The Organising Commission[310] has been recruiting for the work of convening a conference representatives of local organisations in Russia and influential comrades engaged in activity among the masses, so that they should, if possible at once, set up a Russian collegium performing all the practical work in convening the conference, under the general control of the Organising Commission—in the sense of fulfilling directives stated in the resolutions and the letter of the Plenary Meeting.

Written on June 1 (14), 1911

First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from the original

5

STATEMENT[311]

In voting for the resolution as a whole[312] in order to bring together as closely as possible all the Party elements without exception, we resolutely protest against the permissibility

of inviting to the Organising Commission the *Golos* and the *Vperyod* people abroad, i.e., representatives of anti-Party groups which have developed into special factions abroad and which in the 18 months since the Plenary Meeting have proved themselves capable only of acting *against* the Party, only of *slowing down* its work, only of helping the independent legalist labour party or the otzovists.

N. Lenin

Written on June 1 (14), 1911

First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from the original

STATEMENT[313]

In our capacity as members of the meeting we, the undersigned, having learned of the decision of the Technical Commission[314] not to issue any money to the school,[315] declare that we consider this decision downright illegal and motion the following proposal for a vote by the members of the meeting: *Members of the meeting resolve that the amount required for the school (for travelling or living expenses not later than September 1, 1911) should be issued from cash (or the trustee funds)—in accordance with the decision of the Party's School Commission.*

N. Lenin

July 30, 1911

First published in 1961 in Vol. 20 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

INSERTION FOR L. B. KAMENEV'S PAMPHLET *TWO PARTIES**

A *choice should be made* between the party of the revolutionary proletariat and the party of the independent legalists. Every circle or group of the R.S.D.L.P. must tell the workers as much and practise it.

---

* Lenin's introduction to L. B. Kamenev's pamphlet *Two Parties*. See present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 225-28.—*Ed.*

We know that there are people who, while recognising the need to fight the liquidators, object to a complete break with them and continue (even now!) to speak of "conciliation" or "agreement". Among these people are not only the "loyal servitors" of Trotsky, whom very few people now take seriously. The advocates of conciliation and agreement are making a big mistake: the 18 months have shown *in practice* that the legalists *do not fulfil any* obligations. How can there be an agreement with men who do not carry out their obligations?? Isn't it ridiculous to speak of an agreement, when the speaker is unable to state *either* the terms of the agreement *or* the means to secure fulfilment of any terms whatsoever??

Written after July 20 (August 2), 1911

Published in August 1911 in a pamphlet issued by the *Rabochaya Gazeta* Editorial Board in Paris

Printed from the original

PLAN FOR A LECTURE "MANIFESTO OF THE LIBERAL LABOUR PARTY"[316]

1. Why does N. Rozhkov's article in No. 9-10 of *Nasha Zarya* deserve such a name and the most thorough analysis? It affords an opportunity of examining the question of the two lines in the labour movement and the "two parties" outside *any* "conflict" material, *outside* any "squabble".

2. The type of "Social-Democrat of freedom days". Bourgeois democrats in Marxist garb. Rozhkov as a specimen; his article is a *wholesale* substitution of liberalism for Marxism.

3. The role of the serf-owners in modern Russia from the standpoint of the liberals (Rozhkov) and the Marxists. The "December (1908) resolutions" of the R.S.D.L.P.

4. The attitude of democrats to the (Stolypin) solution of the agrarian problem "through a compromise between various groups of the bourgeoisie".

5. Is Russia to have a "triumph of highly moderate bourgeois progressism"?

6. A comparison of modern Russia with her Third Duma and France of the 1860s with her Legislative Corps, and Prussia of 1880s.

7. Have the "old slogans" become a "dead letter"?

8. Why is the Society for the Protection of the Interests of the Working Class, which is being set up by Rozhkov, a society for the *liberal* protection of working-class interests in their *liberal* interpretation?

9. Ratio: Y. Larin is to the labour congress as N. Rozhkov is to the legal liquidationist party.

Written before November 14 (27), 1911

Published in November 1911 in an announcement of the lecture put out by a *Rabochaya Gazeta* circle

Printed from the text of the announcement

PROPOSAL ON RULES FOR THE ORGANISATION ABROAD MOTIONED AT A MEETING OF BOLSHEVIK GROUPS ABROAD[317]

In electing a Committee of the Organisation Abroad[318] to handle the latter's affairs the meeting hands it the draft Rules together with all the remarks, authorising the Committee to poll the groups and give final approval to the Rules through such a poll.

Written on December 16 (29), 1911

First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXV*

Printed from the original

OUTLINE OF A REPORT ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION[319]

Political Situation

1. Crop failure—and the famine. "Food" campaign—Lidvaliad.[320]

2. Stolypin's "agrarian reform": bourgeois wine poured into serf-owning wineskins. They burst.

3. December 1908 about the Stolypin reform[321] and failure of the liquidators and the *Vperyod* people to understand.
4. Commissary trials: stealing.
5. Mismanagement and disorder.
—Cadet and Octobrist press. Flight from St. Petersburg to Moscow, lorry runs, construction of railways, Russian industry in the foreign market, public education and Kasso's "broom"[322] — — — sighs, oh's and ah's, and regrets all over the place.
6. The bourgeoisie craves for the bourgeois system. It wants to "wash the wineskin without dipping it into the water".
7. Revolution is the only way. Fear, hatred, mistrust—against the tide.
8. "Against the tide". For the revolution. The working class and the revolution. For revolution (*n o t* "universal suffrage") is the slogan which sums up the political situation and *determines* the whole content of Party agitation and propaganda (in particular, before the Fourth Duma).

etc.

Crop failure
Commissary trials
Persia
Kasso and rout
The Jews and the "nationalisation of trade".

The Working Class and the Revolution

1. The "revival", of which everyone is talking, is a symptom of the fresh upsurge of the revolution.
2. Attitude to the revolution that was: spite, fear, hatred—cowardice, scepticism, lack of spirit—attitude of the working class ("you'll get another 1905").
3. Tasks of working-class activity in the new conditions
(α) > consciousness of the masses (δ)
(β) > development of capitalism (α)

(γ) > hostility of the bourgeoisie (β)
(δ) > alliance of enemies (γ).

4. Character of agitation and propaganda.
No need for an illegal party
" " " propaganda of revolution (not hegemony)
etc., etc. liquidationism .

Manifestation of bourgeois counter-revolutionary spirit among Social-Democrats.

5. "Bird's-eye view"=Third Duma, Role of (Cadets)

Written at the end of 1911
First published in 1961 in Vol. 21 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*
Printed from the minutes

THE SIXTH (PRAGUE) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.[323]

JANUARY 5-17 (18-30), 1911

1

TO THE DRAFT RESOLUTION "ON THE RUSSIAN ORGANISING COMMISSION FOR CONVENING THE CONFERENCE"[324]

This *regardless* of gratitude.
This concerning the Credentials Committee.
Instead of "gratitude" I suggest we insert (solemn) *r e c o g n i t i o n* of the tremendous importance of what has been done, and *elaborate* on the difficult conditions.

Written not later than January 5 (18), 1912
First published in 1941 in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia* No. 1
Printed from the original

2

OUTLINE OF SPEECH ON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CONFERENCE

1. Break-up and absence of the C.C.
2. Initiative of local organisations in restoring the Party.

Elections to the Fourth Duma.

3. Pressing tasks of practical work have made the task of restoring the Party especially acute.
4. *All* have been invited and only those who refused to help the Party are absent.
5. All organisations operating in Russia are represented.

— — The constitution of the conference as the Party's supreme body whose duty it is to set up authorised central institutions and help to restore Party organisations and Party work everywhere.

---

1) National organisations were invited three or four times.
— — (1) the fault for the separation from Russian organisations has been stated to fall entirely on the non-Russian organisations;
2) partial support for the downright liquidationist (Bundist) aspirations;
helpless vacillations on the question of whether the Party is to be or not to be;
3) which would be the greatest abnormality if the Russian organisations carrying the whole burden of the work in the most important centres of the movement rejected the work and the Party's restoration.

---

4. (1) none for three years;
(2) recognised the need and prepared for two and a half years;
(3) everyone without exception was notified and invited and given a chance to attend;
(4) twenty Russian organisations have rallied round the R.O.C.[325]

Written not later than January 5 (18), 1912

First published on January 18, 1937 in *Pravda* No. 18

Printed from the original

3

REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU

JANUARY 7 (20), 1912

The work at the I.S.B. falls into two parts, one routine: correspondence, distribution of members ... etc.; the other—congresses: Copenhagen and Zurich.[326] Following the London Congress one [representative] was [on the I.S.B.] from the Russian Social-Democrats. The Plenary Meeting also elected Plekhanov, but he refused, saying that one man was enough to do the work. At the Copenhagen Congress we drew closer together and spoke in a friendly manner; I was no longer able to talk to the *Golos* people and looked at Trotsky with disapproval, especially over the letter.[327] Towards the end of the sitting, Plekhanov accepted the Plenary Meeting's proposal. He and I have one vote. Until recently we have had no conflicts of any kind. At Copenhagen I worked on the co-operative committee. Of most interest are the extremely aggravated relations among the German Social-Democrats: unity on the surface and two different trends beneath. On behalf of the German Social-Democrats, one half represents the party and the other, the trade unions. The greater the German delegation numerically, the lower seems the hegemony of the German Social-Democrats to decline. At Stuttgart they covered themselves with disgrace by voting for the colonial resolution.... One of their representatives, for instance, says that it is impossible to expropriate the capitalists. It turns out that in this context their programme says nothing at all about expropriation. What they are actually conducting is not a Social-Democratic line. There should be no illusions about this, for as time goes on the struggle is bound to sharpen and grow; of course, the mass of the proletariat will not vacillate. They staged a walk-out at the Magdeburg Congress, but no Social-Democrat will be intimidated by that kind of thing.[328]

There is a split among the Czechs.[329] We were against the split, feeling that the Social-Democrats should not Succumb to any chauvinist or nationalist agitation. In Austria, there are a great many scandals over the language

to be used in the paper work, etc. Plekhanov was the rapporteur on this split, and his resolution was adopted by a large majority. There again, Trotsky tried his reconciliation, saying that the fault lay with Adler, the most "peaceable" and opportunist Social-Democrat.

The German Social-Democrats are undoubtedly approaching a new epoch—the epoch of the socialist revolution. The economic and military crisis and world complications, all tend to bring out the symptoms of the epoch. There has been preparatory work so far. Now it is the epoch of battles against the bourgeoisie. And that is where the distinction between the reformists and the revolutionary Social-Democrats is being realized. A sitting of the I.S.B. was called at Zurich over Morocco. There was also an incident there. Molkenbuhr wrote a letter in his own name suggesting that no sitting should be held. Rosa Luxemburg published the letter, and that sparked things off.[330] The revolutionary Social-Democrats won out at the last congress. Bebel said that he would take action against Rosa Luxemburg. There was an attempt on the part of the French to get the strike written into the resolution as a means of struggle against war. All the revolutionary Social-Democrats spoke against, arguing that we should not let the government know in advance which weapon we shall take up, and which is most suitable and where. The proposal was rejected. Bebel raised the question of non-publication of the documents, hinting at Rosa Luxemburg and demanding a resolution. I stood up for Rosa Luxemburg. To Bebel's great indignation I quoted Quelch. There Bebel acted as a conciliator. The letter published by Rosa Luxemburg has nothing to do with the [other] documents. Action in the party was the most that should be done against her, and that was done; it was unfair to take the whole thing to the I.S.B....

Various trends have grown up within German Social-Democracy and are bursting to get out; inside, the party is seething. Resolute action is imminent there. A conflict between the reformist and the revolutionary Social-Democrats is inevitable.

First published in 1965
in Vol. 54 of the Fifth Russian
edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from
a record of the
proceedings in
longhand

4

SPEECH ON THE ADOPTION OF THE RESOLUTION ON COMBATING THE FAMINE

JANUARY 8 (21) 1912

The Party should intervene actively, and a resolution should be adopted. As we have discovered from our exchange of opinion, the workers are paying a great deal of attention to the famine and are actively intervening and helping the starving. Helping the starving is not philanthropy. It is philanthropy only with the bourgeois approach. But that is not all. The Cadets have really adopted the standpoint of the ministry officials. We should join the committees which are being set up to fight the famine. I mean the non-Party workers' committees. We should not prescribe their establishment but we should take part in them. The money should best be sent to the Social-Democratic group, the workers' unions, clubs and other societies. We should also publish a leaflet, but preferably addressed to the workers and peasants. We should see to the distribution of the speech by Markov II, who said the starving peasants were idlers. It is a fine speech and makes good reading.

First published in 1965 in Vol. 54 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from a record of the proceedings in longhand

5

DRAFT CHANGES IN THE PARTY'S ORGANISATIONAL RULES*

Organisational Rules

§1—idem.

§2—add about permissibility of co-optation as a provisional measure (in accordance with the December 1908 resolution).

§3—idem.

§4—idem.

§5—idem.

§6—idem.

* See present edition, Vol. 17, p. 482.—*Ed.*

§7—idem.

§8—*out altogether*. More about the C.C.

§9—instead of 1,000 electors—put 30 or 50 and (temporarily) abolish proportional representation.

Note. In view of the pressing state of affairs, the 1912 Conference was constituted as the *Party's supreme body* (see resolution on conference).*

Written not later than January 11 (24), 1912

First published in 1941 in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia* No. 1

Printed from the original

6

SPEECH ON THE ORGANISATIONAL QUESTION

JANUARY 11 (24) 1912

I should like to deal with another aspect of the question. It is about flexibility.... The resolution was correct.[331] I should like to call attention to which side is important. Let us take a legal society as an example. I can't say this about the whole of Russia, but about 5 towns I can say that ... it is possible. And so what does a legal society give us above all? Lectures of a Marxist character: this seems to be permitted. I see from the press that they are permitted in the big towns. It is said that lecturers are hard to come by.... The workers themselves should bring out the lecturers and pay them. Then there are the library and reading room. I don't know whether they are allowed to take *Zvezda*. Then, legal societies arrange all kinds of entertainment. That is important from the financial side, and, besides, the entertainment makes it a kind of club. Now if this type of society is not a fiction, but a reality, and there is no question about that, we should ask ourselves [whether] we have worked to extend such societies. [Whether] we have given reports about such societies at factories and plants. Have we tried to organise such societies? Further, how are these societies to be used? We are now almost similar in type to the German organisation in the epoch of the anti-Socialist laws, but for us it is both harder and

* This paragraph is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed*.

easier. It is harder because legal possibilities were open to them. The C.C. consisted of members of the parliamentary party group, met legally and invited illegal workers. For our part, we have a great deal of sympathy in the masses and support for Social-Democracy. In every society we should have small Social-Democratic cells closely bound up with the Party, deciding on each matter in the spirit of the Party's resolutions.... These cells should not be as unwieldy as the districts and subdistricts. St. Petersburg and Riga fit the [legal] society type. In Moscow, little was done in this respect. And so we find these cells allowing a different type of Party structure. In the past, in my time, we had to do everything ourselves. Today, the trade unions and organisations handle some of the work. Whenever possible, the political struggle is frequently also conducted by the legal Duma group, and if we had more legal societies built on these lines, the revolution would be invincible. That is the question of the organisations' flexibility. It will be the ideal for rebuilding our organisation. These illegal cells surrounded by a network of legal cells will give us a new basis. All contacts should be reduced to a minimum, as though the organisation is and is not there. Let there be no meetings. Party work has assumed a different form. The new form has already wedged into the old. Let it be less formalised but expanding through work in the legal societies. Every step towards culture should be permeated with the Social-Democratic spirit, with Social-Democratic culture.... This will be a resolute fight against the liquidators.... There is a cell, which is connected with the C.O., contacting it once a year and doing a hundred times more than before. We have not done enough in the legal societies. We must wrest them from the hands of the liberals, we must [wrest] the entire legal movement. The legal societies should be spread out and expanded. Concrete attention should be given to how work is being organised in the legal societies. Everywhere the illegal cells should be surrounded by a network of legal cells.

First published in 1965
in Vol. 54 of the Fifth Russian
edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from
a record of the
proceedings in
longhand

7

TO THE DRAFT RESOLUTION "ON THE CHARACTER AND ORGANISATIONAL FORMS OF PARTY WORK"*

Insert at the beginning (α) confirmation of the December 1908 resolution or confirmation of its correctness on the strength of the three years' *experience*; (β) recognition that the work of local Social-Democratic forces is creating a type of party here which is *approximating* to the German one of 1878-90.[332] We should go *forward* along this road [this *instead of* § 1].

In thesis 5, throw out *formalisation* and instead of "expansion" say *strengthening*.

§7—reword more cautiously, as in December 1908.

§9—set out to the effect that the regular distribution of a regularly and frequently published illegal Social-Democratic newspaper is of especial importance for political agitation, for directing the revolutionary struggle, *and for linking up all the illegal organisations and illegal cells* in the various societies.

Written on January 11 (24), 1912

First published in 1941 in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia* No. 1

Printed from the original

8

MATERIAL FOR THE RESOLUTION ON THE "PETITION CAMPAIGN"**

Resolution on the Petition Campaign

Themes:

1) writers' intention unrelated to the masses, [not] com[ing] from the masses;

2) indifferent signing without clear [slogans], without agitation in the [masses], without interest [on the part of the masses];

* See present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 479-80.—*Ed.*

** The MS. is partially damaged, and the words in square brackets have been restored according to the meaning and the text of the adopted resolution.—*Ed.*

3) the text and the character of the petition are unsatisfactory;

4) wresting a partial demand, while the circumstances obtrude generally elementary conditions of freedom [for] the whole people;

5) failure: 1,300 signatures. No support in Kiev, Yekaterinoslav, the Caucasus, etc.;

6) the interest in proletarian meetings has shown that the "[wa]ys" to the masses *should be sought not* where the liquidators want to.

Sum total:

Recognise failure as final.

Petition on the concrete conditions [of the epoch]—one of the least [suitable] means of agitation.

Call to agitation for freedom [of coalition] *in connection with* general [political] demands and revolutionary agitation in the masses.

Draft resolution

To recognise:

1) that the [so]-called "petition campaign" was started by a [group of St. Petersburg writers] of the liquidationist trend, without being a product [of mass struggle], without being connected with active initiative ... by workers' organisations or forward-looking workers;

2) that the said [campaign in virtue of the character] of the petition, and in virtue of the general political conditions, has [inevitably degenerated into a purely formal] and indifferent signing of [a paper] which is of no interest to the masses, [without] broad participation by the workers themselves in discussing ... the petition either in the press or at meetings;

3) that the said petition, circulated and commented upon by the liquidators, advanced an isolated demand for political freedom for one class, the [most] advanced and most revolutionary class, making the demand [outside the general] elementary conditions of political freedom for [the whole people], thereby distorting the tasks in the struggle of the proletariat—[the leader] ... of the whole people—against tsarism and dooming the "campaign" to [failure];

4) that the outcome of the [petition campaign] in question has clearly confirmed that [the whole] scheme was

wrong and isolated from [the workers' mass]: the petition collected only 1,300 signatures, [while] in all the Party organisations, including those [in the Caucasus], Yekaterinoslav and Kiev, and even ... sympathising with the liquidators, the petition campaign, clearly not supported by the [masses], [failed to win] any support at all, just as the [campaign] was given no support [by our Social-Democratic group in the Duma].

Written not later than January 17 (30), 1912

First published in 1941 in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia* No. 1

Printed from the original

PLAN FOR A LECTURE "REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE OF THE RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT"[333]

1. The Lena events[334] and May Day in Russia. Mass strikes and their role.
2. Revolutionary upsurge quite natural; its forerunners and prospects.
3. Importance of the mass strike in modern revolutions. Experience of 1905.
4. Liberalism and democracy confronted by another revolution.
5. Why did the Cadets declare war on "revolutionary sentiments" and condemn the idea of "the need for another revolution in Russian?
6. A new situation in the current revolutionary upsurge. Political parties, Third Duma, elections. The peasantry and the new democratic intelligentsia.
7. "Freedom of coalition" and slogans in a popular revolution: struggle for a republic, an 8-hour working day, confiscation of all landed estates.

Published before June 13, 1912 in an announcement of the lecture put out by the Paris section of the R.S.D.L.P. Organisation Abroad

Printed from the text of the announcement

ROSA LUXEMBURG AND THE POLISH "PARTEI" VORSTAND IN MARTOV'S WAKE[335]

Rosa Luxemburg's statement in *Vorwärts* (on September 14) in defence of the so-called Polish Vorstand and carrying charges against Comrade Radek has forced me to take up the pen despite my great unwillingness to interfere in this matter. I cannot remain silent when the struggle against the liquidators of the Russian Party is being used to vindicate the worst methods of the liquidators.

I have personally witnessed Comrade Radek's vacillation from defence of the extreme Left to defence of the Russian liquidators; I have always fought and will continue to fight politically against all those who defend liquidationism, but that is *precisely why* I must stand up against the disgusting methods used by the so-called Polish Vorstand in the Radek "affair".[336]

What is the principal specific of Martov's "well-known" (bekannt) pamphlet, of which Rosa Luxemburg makes such opportune mention?[337]

It is that Martov, the leader of the liquidators, *after* all the Social-Democrats of Russia, in January 1910, solemnly and unanimously accepted the condemnation of liquidationism and *after peace* in the Party was proclaimed on the basis of this condemnation[338]—a year later, when the liquidators destroyed the Party's C.C. and split away from the Party—Martov put out a pamphlet accusing his opponents of 1,001 dishonest and criminal offences. At the time the Poles called this pamphlet a "stinkbomb", and *even* (sogar, and not selbst) Kautsky called it "abscheulich".*

The very same thing has now been done by the so-called Polish Vorstand with Rosa Luxemburg at its head.

Comrade Radek *was recommended to me personally*, in 1909 and 1910, as a fitting *collaborator for our* Party's *C. O.* and was personally introduced to me, with *the best of references*, at the International Congress at Copenhagen, by the selfsame members of this very Vorstand.

But then, in 1911, Comrade Radek took a political stand against this Vorstand, supporting the Party's Warsaw

* Disgusting, foul.—*Ed.*

Committee, a number of Party members and two of its prominent leaders (Malecki and Hanecki), who exposed the Vorstand for disorganising activity. Comrade Radek helped to establish the truth, namely, that the Polish *Partei*vorstand is a Vorstand *without* a party. In Warsaw, the capital of Poland, this Vorstand *no longer* represents the Warsaw Committee, but its own fictitious little group. The German comrades will soon learn about all this in greater detail. Members of the Russian Social-Democratic Party are aware that there is already a *whole literature* about it, and it is futile on Rosa Luxemburg's part to hush it up (totzuschweigen) before the International!

After Radek took his political stand against the so-called Parteivorstand (*without* a party), this "Partei"vorstand *cooked up* a "trial" against Radek over a "case"—listen to this!—dating back to *1906*!

That is the crux of the matter, and that is what our illustre* Rosa has been trying wegzuschwatzen!**

Rosa Luxemburg and her "Partei"vorstand are currently conducting an unprecedentedly fierce fight against their own party's best workers, stooping so low as to throw out suspicions of their connection with the secret police. Rosa Luxemburg and her "Partei"vorstand have lost their head waging *such* a war against their political opponents.

Is it not now clear why, without going *into the substance* of the "Radek affair", I consider it to be my duty to declare that *the substance* of the case is political revenge by Rosa Luxemburg and her "Partei"vorstand?

Certain methods were described in Russian literature by Turgenev long ago. One old rascal, he wrote, once gave this wise advice: when doing something base, see that you shout loudest about the baseness of the acts you are yourself committing. When robbing the public till, be sure to shout loudest about the vileness of embezzlement....

When the Polish "Partei"vorstand stooped to a repetition of Martov's methods against Comrade Radek—the "Partei"-(v)orstand got Rosa Luxemburg to raise the greatest possible noise in *Vorwärts* about Martov's baseness!... Es ist eine alte

---

* Illustrious.—*Ed.*

** To talk herself out of.—*Ed.*

Geschichte,* but for us Russian émigrés ist sie leider gar nicht "neu"**....

Rosa Luxemburg has been trying to assure her German readers that Comrade Radek "nie die geringste Rolle gespielt hat",*** and so on, and so forth. It is my duty to reply to this elenden Altweiberklatsch**** and state the *precise facts*: in 1909 and 1910, Comrade Radek did a great deal of successful work as a contributor to the Central Organ of the Social-Democratic Party of Russia. I was one of the editors of the Central Organ and I cannot let Rosa Luxemburg's malicious bit of gossip go unanswered.

In order to denigrate Comrade Radek, Rosa Luxemburg praises herself under the name of "polnische Wortführer".***** She puts out a hint that Comrade Radek's "taktischen Ideen"*) are tenuous.

Let me say right away that I consider this tenuousness, this readiness to have "peace" with the Russian liquidators, Comrade Radek's great sin. But I believe it is more excusable in a collaborator who is not responsible for C.O. and C.C. policy than in C.C. and C.O. *members*. It is patent "Intrigenführer",**) like Tyszka, who have always played the prevailing role among the notorious "Polish Wortführern" and it is their *tenuousness* that has done tremendous damage to the whole party.

Let me give two examples to substantiate what I say. The Plenary Meeting of the C.C. of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party in January 1910 *unanimously* condemned liquidationism. The only section of the resolution leaving Tür und Thor***) for opportunism (the so-called §1) as carried on Tyszka's initiative. What is Rosa Luxemburg going to say about that? Will she dare stand up for this §1 from the standpoint of the "radikale Richtung"?****)

---

* It is an old story.—*Ed.*
** It is unfortunately not "new" at all.—*Ed.*
*** "Never played the slightest role."—*Ed.*
**** Petty old wives' tale.—*Ed.*
***** "Polish representatives"—*Ed.*
*) Tactical ideas."—*Ed.*
**) "Masters of intrigue."—*Ed.*
***) A loophole.—*Ed.*
****) "Radical trend."—*Ed.*

When in the spring of 1911 the Bolsheviks withdrew from the so-called C.C. Bureau Abroad in view of the destruction of the C.C. by the liquidators, the Poles remained in that institution *for months together* with the Bundists and the Latvians,[339] of whom *even* (sogar) Plekhanov wrote: "Diese Parteiinstitution, die zum Werkzeug in den Händen einer Gruppe von Leuten geworden war, die die Partei liquidieren wollten und die daher der Sache des russischen Proletariats grossen Schaden zuzufügen drohte, konnte diesem nur einen Gefallen erweisen: nämlich das Zeitliche segnen" (Note: "Tagebuch eines S.D." 2 Beilage zu N 15, S. 1, zitiert in der Schrift: "Der Anonymus aus dem *Vorwärts* und die Sachlage in der Soz. Dem. Arb. P. Russlands"; diese Schrift wurde in die Redaktionen aller s.d. Blätter in Deutschland gesandt).*

On the strength of these facts, the reader will judge whether there is a great deal of truth in Rosa Luxemburg's boastful words to the effect that the Poles "mit starker Faust die liquidatorische Richtung in Russland niederzuhalten geholfen haben".**

In actual fact, by their intrigues the Poles did much more to *hinder* the struggle against this "Richtung"***. Up to now, eight months after the *formal* expulsion of a *definite* group of liquidators from the Party (the magazine *Nasha Zarya*),[340] the notorious "polnische Wortführer" have been unable to give a *straightforward* answer as to whether or not they want "peace" with *this* group. It is, of course, not as easy to give a straightforward answer as to plagiarise the anti-liquidators today and the liquidators tomorrow, declar-

---

* "This party institution, which became a tool in the hands of gentlemen intent on liquidating the party, and which in consequence threatened to inflict great damage on the cause of Russian Social-Democracy, could do the revolutionary proletariat only one good service: suffer a timely demise" (Note: *Dnevnik Sotsial-Demokrata*, Second Supplement to No. 15, p. 1, quoted in "Anonymous in *Vorwärts*, and the State of Affairs in the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Russia"; this article was circulated to the editorial boards of all Social-Democratic newspapers in Germany).—*Ed.*

** "Lent their strong fist to help put down the liquidationist trend in Russia."—*Ed.*

*** Trend.—*Ed.*

ing oneself, on the strength of that, to be "*superior*" to both "factions"!

Rosa Luxemburg takes the occasion of the "Radek case" to assure her German readers that nothing "ausser Trümmern"* is left of the "russische Partei".**

In response to that I must state the actual facts. It is the Polish "Partei"vorstand that is the "Trümmer", because it *has not belonged* to the Party for a whole year. For a whole year, it *has not had* any organisational ties either with the Party C.C., which was elected by the January 1912 Conference,[341] or with the so-called "Organising Committee" of the liquidators.

The Party of the Russian Social-Democratic proletariat, which has divested itself of the liquidators and the intriguers of the Polish "Partei"vorstand, is so far from being Trümmer that it has been developing with especial success since January 1912. Since some—and at times, regrettably, influential—comrades in the German party lend an ear to the frequently biased stories and Klatsch of the Wortführer des polnischen "Partei"vorstandes, who are outside the Party, I shall confine myself to a brief indication of the facts.

Legal Marxist newspapers are the only open *measure* (Maßstab) of the Social-Democrats' influence in Russia and their ties with the workers' masses. *Only* two "trends"—the Party and the liquidators—are represented in Russia. All the rest are a Schwindel.***

In the first half of 1912, the liquidators put out 21 issues of their paper and the anti-liquidators, 100. In the two months of the second half-year (July and August) the former had 4, and the latter—60. In the eight months (from January to August 1912) the former were able to report direct assistance to them from *16* workers' groups, and the latter—from *551*.****

* Except debris.—*Ed.*

** Russian Party.—*Ed.*

*** Swindle.—*Ed.*

**** Vgl. die Schrift "Zur gegenwärtigen Sachlage in der Soz. Dem. A. P. Russlands". Leipzig 1912. Diese Schrift gelangt jetzt in Chemnitz zur Verteilung an die Delegierte der Partei (cf. the article "On the Present Situation in the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Russia", Leipzig 1912. This article is now available in Chemnitz for distribution to party delegates.—*Ed.*).

Rosa Luxemburg with her stories about "Trümmer" should try to refute these facts!

The stories of the polnische "Partei"vorstand about the Russian Party are even less credible than their stories about Radek.

N. Lenin

Written before September 4 (17), 1912

First published in German in 1964 in the magazine *International Review of Social History*, Volume IX. Part 3

Printed from the original

REPLY TO LIQUIDATORS' ARTICLE IN *LEIPZIGER VOLKSZEITUNG*[342]

A note on "a conference of organisations of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party" appeared in No. 226 of *Volkszeitung** on September 28, but is regrettably based on one-sided and unverified facts.

We consider it necessary to point out that the said conference was actually in no sense a conference of Russian Party organisations. Russian workers' centres were not represented at the conference at all. St. Petersburg was represented by the liquidators from the so-called promotion group[343] who do not belong to the Social-Democratic Party and have been fighting it fiercely in their magazine and newspaper.[344] Moscow was represented only by a delegate from an insignificant section of the Party organisation, and he had been given an imperative mandate to conduct the political line of the Party Conference held in January 1912. The rest of Russia (Kiev, Yekaterinoslav, Kharkov, the Volga and Ural regions, the Central Industrial Area, the Don district and many others) was not represented at all, apart from Krasnoyarsk and Sevastopol, but it was only from the liquidators' magazines and the report about the "conference" that the Party learned of there being any sort of organisation in either city.

For a long time it has of course been no secret to the

* *Leipziger Volkszeitung.—Ed.*

Party that a group of liquidators has been trying to call a conference with the assistance of the Bund, which has essentially nothing to do with actual *Russian* Social-Democratic activity. (For the information of German readers let us add that when we speak about *Russian* Party work the Bund is not included because its sphere of activity is confined exclusively to the Jewish proletariat.) However, the real character of this attempt was so clear that Comrade Plekhanov replied to the invitation to attend the "conference" that he would not do so not only because he regarded the "conference" as being one-sided, but also because it was not attended either by the "Party elements" or by the "anti-Party elements". That is exactly what was said in the report published by the Organising Committee of the liquidators' conference in September 1912. But these words of the *neutral* Comrade Plekhanov *are not* in the German report carried in No. 226 of *Volkszeitung* on September 28 inst. We put it now to every German comrade whether this report can be considered honest. Even from the groups abroad which gave their formal consent to the convocation of a conference *together* with the liquidators, the former deputy of the Second Duma, Alexinsky, representing the *Vperyod* group, *left it* as a sign of open opposition to the liquidators' party conference, because he did not regard it as a valid party conference.

It is our duty, however briefly, also to point out the following: In the six months (from January 1 to June 30, 1912), the anti-liquidators' newspapers in St. Petersburg, *Zvezda* and *Pravda*, united 550 workers' groups as against the liquidators' 16. Upon its appearance, the latter's new paper, *Luch*,[345] was given a hostile reception by the St. Petersburg workers, who saw it as an attempt to split the Party. The liquidators were roundly defeated in the election of workers' representatives to the Duma (elections to the workers' curia of the Duma) on September 16 (29). Despite its use of all the means of advertising, the group which had called this private conference of liquidators fighting against the Party, failed to mislead the Russian organisations. It is now making spasmodic efforts through the same advertising channels to misinform the German comrades, at least.

We most resolutely protest against this, and point out that the liquidators' anonymous information will continue to mislead the German comrades until they demand that the "informers" should make a public stand under their own names and with proof in their hands.

Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party

Written after September 16 (29), 1912

Published on October 9, 1912 in *Leipziger Volkszeitung* No. 235
First published in Russian on April 21, 1963 in *Pravda* No. 111

Printed from the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* text
Translated from the German

RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

TO ALL THE CITIZENS OF RUSSIA[346]

Comrades workers and all citizens of Russia!

A war of four powers against Turkey has started in the Balkans.[347] War threatens the whole of Europe. Despite their lying government denials, Russia and Austria are preparing for war. Italy is becoming more brazen in her policy of plundering the Turkish lands. The stock-market panic in Vienna and Berlin, in Paris and London shows that the capitalists of all Europe see no possibility of preserving European peace.

All Europe wants to take part in the events in the Balkans! Everyone favours "reforms" and even "freedom for the Slavs". Actually, Russia wants to snatch a piece of Turkey in Asia and to seize the Bosporus. Austria has designs on Salonika, Italy on Albania, Britain on Arabia, and Germany on Anatolia.

The crisis is mounting. Hundreds of thousands and millions of wage slaves of capital and peasants downtrodden by the serf-owners are going to the slaughter for the dynastic interests of a handful of crowned brigands, for the profits of the bourgeoisie in its drive to plunder foreign lands.

The Balkan crisis is a link in the chain of events which since the turn of the century has everywhere been leading to sharper class and international contradictions, to wars and revolutions. The Russo-Japanese war, the revolution in Russia, a series of revolutions in Asia, mounting rivalry and hostility between the European states, the threat to peace over Morocco, and Italy's plunderous campaign against Tripoli—such has been the preparation of the current crisis.

Wars and all their calamities are produced by capitalism, which keeps millions of working people in bondage, sharpens the struggle between nations, and turns the slaves of capital into cannon fodder. A world-wide socialist army of the revolutionary proletariat is alone capable of putting an end to this oppression and enslavement of the masses and to these massacres of slaves in the interests of the slave-owners.

In Western Europe and America, there is a sharpening struggle by the socialist proletariat against imperialist bourgeois governments, who are increasingly inclined to plunge into desperate escapades as they see the working-class millions inexorably marching to victory. These governments are preparing war but at the same time are afraid of war in the knowledge that world-wide war means world-wide revolution.

In Eastern Europe—the Balkans, Austria and Russia—alongside areas of highly developed capitalism, we find the masses oppressed by feudalism, absolutism and thousands of medieval relics. Like tens of millions of peasants in Central Russia, the peasants in Bosnia and Herzegovina, on the Adriatic coast, are still ground down by the landowning serf-masters. The piratical dynasties of the Hapsburgs and the Romanovs support this medieval oppression and try to stoke up hostility between the peoples in an effort to strengthen the power of the monarchy and perpetuate the enslavement of a number of nationalities. In Eastern Europe, the monarchs still share out the peoples between them, exchange and trade in them, putting together different nationalities into patchwork states to promote their own dynastic interests, very much as the landowners under the serf system used to break up and shuffle the families of their subject peasants!

A federal Balkan republic is the rallying cry that our brother socialists in the Balkan countries have issued to the masses in their struggle for self-determination and complete freedom of the peoples, to clear the way for a broad class struggle for socialism.

It is the rallying cry of true democrats and real friends of the working class and we must take it up with especial vigour in face of the Russian tsarist monarchy, one of the most vicious supporters of reaction throughout the world.

The foreign policy of Russian tsarism is an unbroken chain of unprecedented crimes and acts of violence, and the dirtiest and basest intrigues against the freedom of nations, against democracy and against the working class. With the aid of Britain's "liberal" rulers, tsarism is crushing and choking Persia; tsarism has been undermining the republic in China; tsarism is sneaking up to seize the Bosporus and extend "its" own territory at the expense of Turkey in Asia. The tsarist monarchy was the gendarme of Europe in the 19th century, when Russian serf-peasant troops put down the uprising in Hungary. Today, in the 20th century, the tsarist monarchy is the gendarme of both Europe and Asia.

Tsar Nicholas the Bloody, who has dispersed the First and Second Dumas, who has drowned Russia in blood, enslaved Poland and Finland, and is in alliance with out-and-out reactionaries conducting a policy of stifling the Jews and all "aliens", the tsar whose loyal friends shot down the workers on the Lena and ruined the peasants to the point of starvation all over Russia—that tsar pretends to be the champion of Slav independence and freedom!

Since 1877, the Russian people have learned a thing or two, and they are now aware that worse than all the Turks are our "*internal Turks*"—the tsar and his servants.

But the landowners and the bourgeoisie, the Nationalists and the Octobrists give their utmost support to this vile and provocative lie about a freedom-loving tsarism. Such papers as *Golos Moskvy*[348] and *Novoye Vremya* are at the head of a whole army of government newspapers brazenly baiting and badgering Austria, as though Russian tsarism was not a hundred times more sullied in dirt and blood than the Hapsburg monarchy.

And it is not only the Right-wing parties, but even the opposition, liberal bourgeoisie that has been strident in its chauvinistic imperialist propaganda, scarcely covered up with diplomatically evasive and hypocritical phrases. Not only the non-party liberal *Russkoye Slovo*,[349] but even *Rech*, the official organ of the Party of "Constitutional-Democrats" (actually counter-revolutionary liberals), has been zealous in attacking the tsarist Minister Sazonov for his alleged "tractability", for his "concessions" to Austria and for inadequate "protection" of Russia's "great power" interests. The Cadets have been blaming the wildest nationalist reactionaries not for their imperialism, but on the contrary for minimising the weight and the importance of the "great" idea of the tsarist conquest of Constantinople!!

For the sake of the vital interests of all the working people, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party raises its voice in resolute protest against this base chauvinism and brands it as a betrayal of the cause of freedom. A country with 30 million starving peasants and with the wildest arbitrary rule by the authorities, including the shooting of workers in their hundreds a country where tens of thousands of fighters for freedom are being tormented and tortured through hard labour—what such a country needs above all is liberation from tsarist oppression. The Russian peasant must think about emancipating himself from the landowning serf-masters and from the tsarist monarchy, and not allow himself to be diverted from this vital cause by the false speeches of landowners and merchants about Russia's "Slavonic tasks".

Imperialist liberalism, desirous of tolerating tsarism, may insist on "peaceful constitutional" action, promising the people both external victories and constitutional reforms under a preserved tsarist monarchy, but the Social Democratic proletariat indignantly rejects this fraud. The only thing that can ensure free development for Russia and the whole of Eastern Europe is the revolutionary overthrow of tsarism. Only the victory of a federal republic in the Balkans, together with the victory of a republic in Russia, can release hundreds of millions of people from the calamities of war and the torments of oppression and exploitation in the so-called "time of peace".

In the first five months of 1912, more than 500,000 workers in Russia rose to political strikes, restoring their strength after the most trying years of the counter-revolution. In some places, sailors and soldiers rose up in revolt against tsarism. Our call is for revolutionary mass struggle, for more steadfast, stable and extensive preparation for resolute joint action by the workers, peasants and the best section of the army! That is the only salvation for Russia, which has been oppressed and ruined by tsarism.

The socialists of the Balkan countries have come out with a sharp condemnation of the war. The socialists of Italy and Austria and the whole of Western Europe have given them unanimous support. Let us join in their protest and unfold our agitation against the tsarist monarchy.

Down with the tsarist monarchy! Long live the democratic republic of Russia!

Long live the federal republic of the Balkans!

Down with war! Down with capitalism!

Long live socialism, long live international revolutionary Social-Democracy!

R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee

Written before October 10 (23), 1912

Published in October 1912 as a separate leaflet

Printed from the text of the leaflet

ON POLITICAL SPINELESSNESS

(LETTER TO THE EDITOR)

As a regular reader of *Pravda*,[350] I feel bound to express my deep indignation over the behaviour of the elector P. Sudakov

The elections take place on October 5. Sudakov is not on *Pravda*'s list. None the less, Sudakov is returned by the votes of its supporters—as the results of the elections show. It is also evident that apart from the votes of *Pravda*'s supporters (27-31 out of 50) Sudakov also receives a dozen or so votes from someone else, possibly vacillating voters.

And so Sudakov himself starts vacillating. The day after the election, October 6, *Pravda* carries his report which says, in black and white, the following: "All those elected,

with the exception of Comrade Petrov, belong to the supporters of *Pravda* and *Zvezda*."

That's clear, isn't it?

But within 24 hours, Sudakov puts in an appearance in *Luch*! Sudakov admits that he has been to *Pravda*'s editorial office but, he says, "only as the editorial office of a Social-Democratic newspaper"!! I wonder if this Sudakov isn't a babe-in-arms. Who is going to believe him that he knew nothing about the two Social-Democratic papers? That he did not know about the liquidators, when he himself understands the liquidators?

"If I did say," Sudakov writes in the liquidationist *Luch*, "that I read *Pravda* and side with it" (please note Sudakov declaring that he sides with *Pravda*!), "it was only in the sense" (sic) "that I do in general" (sic) "side" (is that all?) "with the Social-Democrats."

What is one to make of all this! Here is a man who is aware of the existence of the two papers, admitting that he did say that he "sided with *Pravda*", and who the next day takes a "senatorial explanation" to the liquidationist newspaper, merely in the sense that he allegedly sides with the Social-Democrats in general!!

We are not aware of a more crying instance of spinelessness and vacillation.

There have always been "Tushino turncoats"[351]—deserters from one trend to another—but turncoats have never had the respect of the workers.

Pravda No. 145, October 17, 1912
Signed: *Regular reader of "Pravda"*

Printed from the *Pravda* text

REPORT TO THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU, "ELECTIONS TO THE FOURTH DUMA"[352]

The coup of June 3 (16), 1907, opened the epoch of counter-revolution in Russia. Everyone knows about the judicial and administrative lawlessness, the persecutions and tortures of those condemned to penal servitude that crowned this triumph of tsarism.

The upper sections of the bourgeoisie, terrified by the revolution, supported the counter-revolutionary gentry.

Tsarism was sure that it would find support and assistance among the counter-revolutionary elements of the bourgeoisie and landowners.

The electoral law of June 3 (16), 1907, is a specimen of barefaced rigging. Here are some data characterising it:

The population is divided into "curias": landowners, first- and second-category urban dwellers, peasants, Cossacks and workers. Electors, elected separately by curias (sometimes not directly, but through representatives), are grouped by the government into gubernia electoral assemblies, and the latter elect the deputies to the Duma.

The law distributes the electors in such a way that in the electoral assemblies of 28 gubernias (out of 50) only the landowners are assured of a majority in advance, and in the rest—the electors of the first urban curia (big capitalists).

Here is the overall picture: 200,000 gentry have 2,594 electors in the electoral assemblies of 53 gubernias, that is, 49.4 per cent of the total number of electors; 500,000 or so capitalists of the first urban curia have 788 electors (15 per cent); almost 8 million townsfolk of the second urban curia have 590 electors (11.2 per cent); nearly 70 million peasants and Cossacks have 1,168 electors (22.2 per cent); and nearly 12 million workers—112 electors (2.1 per cent).

No wonder this electoral law has produced a "black" counter-revolutionary Duma—a real "Chambre introuvable".[353] What is surprising is that not only bourgeois liberals, but even Social-Democrats have managed to get their representatives into such a Duma.

In the workers' curia, all electors are Social-Democrats. The ultra-reactionary gentry, with a majority in the gubernia electoral assemblies, have been forced to let in the Social-Democrats (in six gubernias, the law stipulates the election of one deputy from the workers; in other gubernias, the Social-Democrats obtain mandates through agreements with the liberals).

The Third Duma was dominated by the Octobrist Party—a party of the reactionary gentry and big capitalists subservient to tsarism. But even these "slaves" failed to satisfy the Nicholas II camarilla, this black band of brigands organising pogroms and attempts on the life of opposition deputies.

The government, which rigged the elections to get the Octobrists into the Third Duma, has now falsified the elections to get the more "loyal" parties—the "Nationalists" and "extreme Rightists"—into the Fourth Duma.

The pressure has been unprecedented. The priests have been ordered to take massive part in the elections and get the Rightists in; the arrests of the opposition candidates, the fines imposed on the press, the closure of newspapers, the dropping of suspects from the electoral rolls—all that was applied, with such cynicism that even the Rightists and even the gentry were impelled to protest.

As a result, we have an even "blacker" and even more Rightist Duma, but it is the Octobrists that today turn out to be the defeated party. The liberal opposition and revolutionary democracy (Social-Democratic workers and peasant bourgeois democrats) have almost managed to retain the status quo.

The latest data on 438 (out of 442) deputies up for election to the Fourth Duma warrant the following comparison:

	Third Duma	Fourth Duma	
Democracy			
Social-Democrats . . .	13	14	
Trudoviks	14	11	25
Liberals			
Cadets	52	61	
Progressists	36	33	
Poles	18	14	
Moslems	9	5	113
Rightists			
Octobrists	131	79	
Nationalists	91	74	
Extreme Rightists . .	46	140	293
Non-party	27	7	
Total	437	438	

Let us add a few words to explain the names and groupings of the parties:

Social-Democrats: the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. Trudoviks: peasant democrats, i.e., revolutionary

bourgeois democrats, whose programme includes the expropriation of the gentry. Cadets: the Constitutional-Democratic Party, actually a counter-revolutionary liberal bourgeois party. Progressists[354]: the same liberals, but slightly more moderate. Poles and Moslems—the same thing, but on national lines. Altogether the opposition consists of 25 democrats and 113 liberals, or 138 deputies (142 in the Third Duma).

Government parties: the Octobrists speak of the constitution rarely and under their breath; the Nationalists never speak of the constitution. The Rightists openly favour a return to autocracy and oppose the constitution. Not only the Octobrists, but even a section of the Nationalists have been impelled towards the opposition by the election rigging.

As for the Social-Democrats, the following have been elected by this time:

Six deputies from the workers' curia are Social-Democrats: Badayev from St. Petersburg; Malinovsky from Moscow; Samoilov from Vladimir; Shagov from Kostroma; Muranov from Kharkov; and Petrovsky from Yekaterinoslav. All six are workers. Then Social-Democrats have also been returned in three gubernias through agreement between democrats (socialists and Trudoviks) and liberals against the Rightists. Returned in this manner were: Khaustov from Ufa; Buryanov from Taurida Gubernia; Tulyakov from the Don Region. Then three Social-Democrats were returned from the Caucasus: Chkheidze, Chkhenkeli and Skobelev, the latter being elected by the Russian population of the Caucasus.

Two Social-Democrats were returned from Siberia: Rusanov and, from the Amur Region, Ryslev.

Let us add, too, that the election of one Social-Democrat from Irkutsk Gubernia (Siberia) was virtually assured (11 electors out of 20 were Social-Democrats). However, the governor has declared the election of six Social-Democrats in the city of Irkutsk invalid. The elections have not yet been held.

It is also necessary to add that in Warsaw, as a result of a bloc between the Bund and the P.P.S., Jagiello, a member of the Polish Socialist Party,[355] was elected deputy.

All these data are preliminary. The full composition of all the groups of the Fourth Duma, including the Social-Democratic group, will become known after the Duma opens on November 15 (28).

Cracow, November 11, 1912

The newspaper *Le Peuple* No. 325, November 20, 1912
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Printed from the text of the book *Correspondance entre Lénine et Camille Huysmans. 1905-1914*, Paris
Translated from the French

MORE ABOUT THE PEASANT DEPUTIES IN THE FOURTH DUMA

Novoye Vremya recently reported the final organisation of a separate peasant group in the Fourth Duma. The report says that it consists of 40 men. The group's bureau consists of Yevseyev, Karaulov, Ichas, Firsov and Mershchy.

"Karaulov (a Cossack)," wrote *Novoye Vremya*, "is said to be one of the most vigorous men in the new group; he drew public attention by his original definition of party affiliation in the form which members of the Duma are asked to fill in by the magistrate office. In the 'party affiliation' column Karaulov wrote: 'I do not belong to any party or faction. I am what every man who truly loves his country must be: I am a monarchist-democrat.'"

Can we accept that such a definition of party affiliation is "original"? Yes and no. Yes, considering that Karaulov has frankly expressed what many are afraid to say. No, because in point of fact Deputy Karaulov's opinion is notoriously shared by a very considerable number of peasants and Cossacks.

Incidentally, Deputy Karaulov believes that "every man who truly loves his country" *must* be a democrat. Deputy Karaulov is clearly mistaken. Let him look at all the Right-wing half or even the Right-wing two-thirds of the Duma: can he truly say that among all these "Rightists"—from "Nationalists" to Octobrists—there is *no one* "who truly loves his country"? Karaulov must concede that there probably is.

But it is *quite obvious* that the Rightists, and the Nationalists, and the Octobrists (and, honestly speaking, the Cadets as well) are *not* "democrats".

They are all monarchists, that is beyond question, but they are *not* democrats. They either do not at all favour a democratic electoral law, democratic laws on the press, on association and assembly, democratic distribution of landed property, or talk their way out of the serious problems of democracy.

What then is to be done? Is it not clear that the landowners, for instance, take a *different* view of "true love for the country" than the peasants, although both may be monarchists?

The work of the Fourth Duma will surely make Karaulov and men like him give serious thought to this.

Written on November 27-28 (December 10-11), 1912

First published in 1961 in Vol. 22 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

RESOLUTION OF THE CRACOW MEETING OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE WITH PARTY FUNCTIONARIES[356]

ON THE REORGANISATION AND WORK OF THE *PRAVDA* EDITORIAL BOARD

1. The Editorial Board lacks consistency of Party principle. The Editorial Board is strongly advised to see to the stricter observance and implementation of all Party decisions. Its proceedings must be conducted on legal lines.

The C.C. is taking steps to reorganise the Editorial Board.

2. The Editorial Board has failed to provide the necessary response to Party life among Social-Democratic workers in St. Petersburg. Reports or mention of Party resolutions must be unconditionally legal in form.

3. The Editorial Board must give more attention to explaining the error and harm of liquidationism in general and of the sermons of *Luck* in particular.

4. The Editorial Board must give more attention to campaigning for subscriptions and collections among the workers.

5. The Bolshevik section of the deputies must take part in the paper's broad editorial collegium and organise systematic and persistent participation in the literary and economic side of the business.

6. The Editorial Board must be especially circumspect in its attitude to its *Vperyod* contributors to avoid hampering the rapprochement that has begun and to prevent the adoption of an erroneous principled line.

7. Every effort must be made to reduce publishing costs and to set up a small governing collegium (running the whole business) on which there must be at least one representative of the Six.[357]

There is need for a similar governing collegium (economic commission) on which one of the Six must be seated, to handle the economic side of the business.

8. Articles which the C.C. considers obligatory for insertion must be carried immediately (under a code name).[358]

9. While strictly maintaining the newspaper's legal character, it is necessary to recruit for active participation both in literary work on the newspaper and in its distribution workers' societies, leagues, committees, groups and individuals in St. Petersburg and in the provinces.

10. Support should be given to the initiative of the group of St. Petersburg Social-Democrats in the publication of a general trade union organ of anti-liquidationist orientation, carefully verifying what is being done on the spot.

11. Measures must be taken to bring the literary and the economic side of the newspaper and the magazine[359] closer together.

12. The starting of a daily workers' newspaper in Moscow as a branch of the St. Petersburg paper must be vigorously pursued. With this end in view, organisational connections should be established between the Moscow group and the three deputies of the Moscow Region.

First published in 1956
in the magazine *Voprosy Istorii*
No. 11

Printed from
a copy written in
N. K. Krupskaya's
hand

LETTER TO THE EXECUTIVE OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY[360]

Dear Comrades!

On the proposal of the Central Committee, the conference of representatives of the C.C. and local workers in Russia operating in various branches of Social-Democratic activity, has discussed your letter of December 28, 1912, stating your desire to "call a conference and direct debates".

While expressing gratitude for your attention to our Party affairs, the conference has unanimously decided to *reject* your proposal.

We Russian revolutionary Social-Democrats have very great respect for the party of the German revolutionary proletariat. We want the most fraternal relations to exist between the Russian and the German Social-Democratic parties. Being unwilling, therefore, to leave any misunderstanding, we shall try to make a frank statement to you, dear comrades, of the motives by which we were guided in rejecting your proposal.

Let us start, for instance, with the *aim* of your projected conference.

You believe that it should have the aim "to work out a common party programme and organisational rules," and invite us to inform you of our draft for the one and the other.

But our Party has had a Party programme for a long time. Back in 1903, i.e., ten years ago, our programme was approved by our Party's Second Congress. Since then hundreds of thousands, and in the revolutionary years, millions of proletarians in Russia have proved their loyalty to this programme by fighting under our Party's standard. We remain true to this programme today. We believe its revision to be *quite* superfluous.

For your information we wish to tell you that up to now not *even* the liquidators have demanded any revision of the Party programme—at any rate they have not done so openly.

Efforts to reach agreement by different groups and groupings concerning a new programme imply the *absence of a party*. But the R.S.D.L.P. *is there*, and the working class

of Russia continues to struggle under its standard. Our Party has faced and partially still faces some very hard times. But it has not ceased to exist for a single minute—contrary to the liquidators' assertions. Only the latter (i.e., men outside the Party) will find acceptable any negotiations on working out some new Party programme—apparently for some new party. (What has been said applies, with slight modifications, to the working out of a new set of Party rules.)

Furthermore, we are divided from the liquidators by profound differences of principle—above all on the question of another revolution in Russia. Our Party (including the *pro-Party* Mensheviks, with G. V. Plekhanov at their head) takes the stand that the working class of Russia and its Party must work for a new revolution in Russia which alone could bring our country true political freedom. That is precisely what the liquidators deny. All their tactics are based on the assumption that development in Russia will take a more or less peaceful constitutional way.

You will easily understand, dear comrades, that from *these* cardinal differences inevitably flows a series of contradictions on all questions of Party work. The liquidators repudiate our present R.S.D.L.P., which can now exist only illegally (although it is capable of conducting and *does conduct* legal Social-Democratic work in many branches). The liquidators have been trying to wreck our present organisation in the hope of establishing a legal labour party in present-day Russia. (Let us note here that even the liberal Cadets have been unable to secure legal status for their party.) Hence the split, which is entirely and exclusively the work of the liquidators.

Very naturally these disputes, these cardinal differences can be resolved *o n l y* by the conscious Russian workers themselves, only by our own Russian Social-Democratic organisations and *no one else*.

In fact, the Russian workers have already taken a long step in that direction.

The recent election to the Fourth Duma has shown that the Russian proletariat is overwhelmingly behind the standpoint taken by our old Party with its revolutionary programme and tactics.

All six deputies elected under the law from the workers' curia are Bolsheviks.

These six deputies represent nine-tenths of working-class Russia and they have openly declared themselves to be opposed to the liquidators.

Russia's *first* working-class Social-Democratic daily (the St. Petersburg *Pravda*) was founded and is kept going by the workers themselves, on the pennies of the workers, namely, workers belonging to the same (Bolshevik) trend. Consequently, the unity of the vast *majority* of workers is being created in action, at the grass roots, in the depths of the working mass. That is the *only* unity that is vital, and it alone will lead to the complete cohesion of the workers' forces.

We shall not conceal from you, comrades, that in the given circumstances we regard mediation by the German Parteivorstand* as being altogether unacceptable. Either for lack of information or for some other reason, the Vorstand has not displayed impartiality in respect of the liquidators and us. Let us recall at least these two facts.

1) The Central Organ of the fraternal German Party (*Vorwärts*)[361] gets aside whole columns for gross attacks by the liquidators on our January 1912 Party Conference, whereas we are being denied the opportunity of inserting even a purely factual refutation, which is a violation of the most elementary duties in respect of us.

2) During the election campaign, the Vorstand, despite our protests, gave cash assistance to the liquidators, but denied it to the Central Committee. The Vorstand gave a subsidy to the Bund, to the Caucasian Regional Committee[362] and the Latvians, *i.e.*, the liquidator O.C.,[363] because everyone knows that it is these three organisations that mainly constitute the liquidator O.C. And the liquidators used the German workers' money to start their publication of a Konkurrenzorgan** *Luch* in St. Petersburg, whose first issue appeared *on the very day of the election* and helped to aggravate the split.

To give cash assistance to one side against the other during a split is a step absolutely unheard of throughout the Inter-

* Party Executive.—*Ed.*
** Rival organ.—*Ed.*

national. Having taken such a step, the Vorstand issued a challenge to the supporters of the January Conference and showed that it was unable to remain impartial.

It is with deep regret that we must frankly tell you, comrades, that the German comrades' supply of information concerning Russian affairs is thoroughly *defective*. This also explains your various proposals, such as a conference of 12 "trends" (small semi-student groups abroad), ignoring the organisations in Russia, or the plan to call together five organisations, etc. This also explains the barefaced attempts on the part of the liquidators simply to deceive you: for example, their attempt to obtain money from you on the strength of the allegation that in the summer of 1912 the Bolsheviks of Kharkov and Moscow united with the liquidators. Actually, however, it is in Kharkov and Moscow that Bolsheviks, implacable opponents of liquidationism (deputies Muranov and Malinovsky), were elected, and they were elected *in the struggle* with the latter. This also explains why during the elections you gave cash aid to the groups (the Bund, P.P.S., P.S.D.[364]) which clashed sharpest at the election and which produced from their midst Jagiello, *the only* deputy not to be accepted as a full-fledged member of the Social-Democratic group, and who was admitted by the slimmest majority of 7 votes to 6.

It is high time, comrades, to put an end to all this. Instead of listening to incompetent informants, you must open the pages of your organs for an objective explanation of the state of affairs in the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party and for its illumination in the light of principle, namely, for articles signed by responsible spokesmen of the several Party groups.

If you want to know about our affairs, you must draw your information about them from documents and literature, as you do, for instance, in following the struggle of various trends in Italy, Britain, etc. Otherwise, you will unwittingly take steps which may frequently be seen by Russian workers as a quite undeserved affront.

Written on March 2 (15), 1913

First published in 1960
in the magazine *Kommunist* No. 6

Printed from
a typewritten copy
Translated from the
German

PRAVDA'S ANNIVERSARY

(WORKERS' SUPPORT FOR THE WORKING-CLASS NEWSPAPER)

A year has passed since the appearance of *Pravda*'s first issue. It originated as a *workers*' newspaper, created by the celebrated upswing of the working-class movement in Russia in April and May 1912.

Pravda has withstood incredible hardships and harassments and has consolidated its positions (insofar as a workers' newspaper can be "consolidated" in modern Russia) through the support of the working class. *Pravda* has been more than a *workers*' newspaper *in name*: any newspaper can adopt a name. *Pravda* has been a workers' newspaper *in fact*, in its orientation, in its range of readers from the working mass, and in its content in general, notably the mass of; reports from the workers (1,783 workers' reports in the first 99 issues; a total of *almost 5,000*), and, finally, *in the support* "*Pravda*" has been given by workers in general and by workers' groups in particular.

Earlier on we pointed out in *Pravda* (see Nos. 80 and 103 for 1912)* the exceptional importance of the data on support for *Pravda* through cash contributions by workers' groups. Their importance goes well beyond the framework of financial assistance, although workers' financial assistance is extremely important and necessary to improve the newspaper at all times.

But contributions from workers' groups are equally, if not more, important in their moral, educational and organisational significance for all class-conscious workers and for the working class of Russia as a whole.

By developing the habit of giving *regular* support for *their own* working-class newspaper not only through subscriptions and distribution but also through regular contributions, the workers are rallied even closer around a newspaper of *their own* trend, the workers are *organised* into something ideologically coherent, the workers verify the progress

* See present edition, Vol. 18, pp. 187-202 and 299-301.—*Ed.*

of their awakening as they read reports about the contributions at a neighbouring factory or one they know of. It is, therefore, impossible to over-emphasise the need to extend and develop in every possible way the custom of *regular* (it is better to have them small but *regular*) contributions and collections by groups of workers for the workers' newspaper.

The published reports showed that before *Pravda* came out over 4,000 rubles had been collected and sent in through the newspaper *Zvezda* by 500 workers' groups. From the day of our paper's first issue up to April 10, contributions totalling 3,932 rubles 42 kopeks were received, only according to reports published in *Pravda*. Of them, 79.9 per cent came from proletarians of various categories, 20 per cent from various groups of intellectuals, and 0.1 per cent from the peasants. By districts the total is distributed as follows: St. Petersburg—66.3 per cent (2,605 rubles 81 kopeks), of which only 10 per cent falls to the intelligentsia; Moscow, Vladimir and Kostroma—4.6 per cent, of which contributions from the intelligentsia occur only in Moscow District (Let us explain at this point that apart from other reasons, these three districts showed small participation in collections for *Pravda* because they also made collections for the Moscow paper.[365] The money sent only through our newspaper comes to more than 2,000 rubles, of which 70 per cent falls to these three districts and 25 per cent to St. Petersburg District. Once again the St. Petersburg workers showed their political maturity: they also took an active part in setting up the Moscow newspaper); the Urals, Siberia, the Baltic Area and Poland—10.3 per cent; Kharkov and Yekaterinoslav districts—4.4 per cent; elsewhere (Finland, Western Europe, etc.)—14.5 per cent.

These figures are sufficiently eloquent evidence of who is the owner of the newspaper, who has kept *Pravda* going and how intimately it is connected with the workers' masses.

In this context, *Pravda*'s successes in the first year were *very* great. To avoid tiring our readers with a lot of figures, we shall not give the monthly but the quarterly (that is, three-month) figures for workers' group collections for *Pravda*.

Years	Number of workers' group collections	
	Pravda	Moscow workers newspapers
1912, first quarter	108	—
" second quarter	396	—
" third quarter	81	—
" fourth quarter	35	5
1913, first quarter	309	129
1913, first 10 days of April . . .	93	43
Total	1,022	177

And so we find that in its first year, *Pravda* met with support from *more than 1,000 groups of workers* and laid the foundation for the *workers*' paper of Russia's *main* industrial area, namely, the Moscow Central Area.

It goes without saying that *financial* support for *Pravda* from a thousand workers' groups implies *all kinds* of support from a much greater number of workers' groups; it means that *tens of thousands* of workers have rallied and united round *Pravda*. There is no doubt at all that the number of groups making cash contributions is only a small fraction of the groups of *Pravda* readers and friends, who helped it by their letters and reports, who helped to circulate the paper, to introduce it among new workers, new sections of the working people, etc.

The working class has advanced a whole vanguard of "front-rankers" who have given a start in the capital to *their own*, Marxist workers' newspaper which is hostile to liberal vacillation, and have inaugurated a *second* workers' newspaper in the heart of industrial Russia. What the advanced, class-conscious workers have done for *Pravda* and for the Moscow workers' newspaper enables us to pass unerring judgement on the sum total of the great work done by the workers for the enlightenment and the organisation of their class. For, after all, *Pravda* and the Moscow newspaper are only a *part*, even if an important one, of this great cause.

Encouraged by the success of the first year of the workers' newspaper, the advanced workers will join forces in untiring,

persistent effort to continue the great cause of enlightening and rallying ever broader masses of the proletariat round the ideas of Marxism!

Pravda No. 92
April 23, 1913

Printed from
the *Pravda* text

THE STRUGGLE OF PARTIES IN CHINA

The Chinese people have succeeded in overthrowing the old medieval system and the government supporting it. A republic has been established in China, and the *first parliament* of that great Asian country, which had long gladdened the hearts of the reactionaries of all nationalities by its immobility and stagnation—the first Chinese Parliament has been elected, convened and has been sitting for several weeks.

In the Lower of the two chambers of the Chinese Parliament, a small majority belongs to the supporters of Sun Yat-sen, the Kuomintang Party, the "Nationalists"—to express this party's essence in the context of Russian conditions, it should be called a radical-Narodnik republican party, a party of democracy. In the Upper Chamber it has a more considerable majority.

This party is opposed by smaller moderate or conservative parties with all sorts of names like "Radicals", and so on. Actually, *all* these parties are parties of *reactionaries*, namely, bureaucrats, landowners and reactionary bourgeoisie. They all gravitate to the Chinese Cadet Yüan Shih-k'ai, the provisional President of the Republic, who has been acting more and more like a dictator. As a Cadet he has been running true to form: yesterday he was a monarchist; now that revolutionary democracy has won out, he is a republican; tomorrow he intends to be the head of state, again a monarchist state, that is, to betray the Republic.

Sun Yat-sen's party is based on the *south* of China, which is the most advanced, the most developed industrially and commercially, and where the influence of Europe has been greatest.

Yüan Shih-k'ai's parties are based on the backward *north* of China.

The early clashes have so far ended in a victory for Yüan Shih-k'ai: he has united all the "moderate" (i.e., reactionary) parties, split off a section of the "Nationalists", got *his* man to fill the post of President of the Lower Chamber of Parliament, and *contrary to* the will of Parliament, secured a *loan* from "Europe", i.e., Europe's swindling billionaires. The terms of the loan are hard, downright usurious, with the salt gabelle as security. The loan will put China in pawn to the most reactionary and plunderous European bourgeoisie, which is prepared to stamp out the freedom of any nation once profits are involved. The European capitalists will reap tremendous profits on this loan of almost 250 million rubles.

This turns out to be an alliance between reactionary fear of the European proletariat on the part of the European bourgeoisie and the reactionary classes and sections of China.

For Sun Yat-sen's party the struggle against this alliance is a very hard one.

What is this party's weakness? It lies in the fact that it has *not* yet been able *sufficiently* to involve *broad masses* of the Chinese people in the revolution. The proletariat in China is still very weak—there is therefore no leading class capable of waging a resolute and conscious struggle to carry the democratic revolution to its end. The peasantry, lacking a leader in the person of the proletariat, is terribly downtrodden, passive, ignorant and indifferent to politics. Despite the revolutionary overthrow of the old and thoroughly corrupt monarchy, despite the victory of the republic, China has *no* universal suffrage! The elections to Parliament had a qualification: only those who had property valued at about 500 rubles were entitled to vote! This also shows how *little* of the really broad popular mass has yet been drawn into active support of the Chinese Republic. But without such *massive* support, without an organised and steadfast leading class, the Republic *cannot be* stable.

Still, despite its leader Sun Yat-sen's major shortcomings (pensiveness and indecision, which are due to his lack of proletarian support), revolutionary democracy in China has done a great deal to awaken the people and to win freedom and consistently democratic institutions. By

drawing ever broader masses of the Chinese peasantry into the movement and into politics, Sun Yat-sen's party is becoming (to the extent to which this process is taking place) a great factor of progress in Asia and of mankind's progress. Whatever defeats it may suffer from political rogues, adventurers and dictators, who rely on the country's reactionary forces, this party's efforts will not have been in vain.

Written on April 28 (May 11), 1913

Published on May 3, 1913 in *Pravda* No. 100

Printed from the *Pravda* text

CONCERNING THE EDITORIAL IN THE NEWSPAPER *LUCH* No. 189

...* The phrase about a struggle waged by "every available means" does not commit anyone to anything. That is pretty clear. On the contrary, the phrase seems to have been deliberately chosen to justify the evasiveness of the liberals. What are "available" means? Is the leader writer in *Luch* so childishly naive, is he such a political simpleton that he is not aware that *villainous* means are "available" to Russian liberalism?? He is aware, but he says nothing, thereby putting a nice make-up on liberalism.

The liberal millionaire, the industrialist Konovalov, who got into the Duma through a gross fraud on democracy (a fine villainous means!), has obtained permission to set up a *Russkaya Molva* society, with a capital of *half a million rubles*, with the aim of coupling the Cadets with the Octobrists in the "Progressist" newspaper *Russkaya Molva*.[366]

That is a fact, and *Luch* is aware of it. But together with these Konovalovs and their hack writers *Luch* signs a resolution on a "struggle by every available means". I put this to any worker and any thinking peasant: Isn't it clear that this resolution *cheats the people* by deliberately using vague words about "availability", while the Konovalovs are *notoriously* known to regard as "available" only those means which cannot seriously inconvenience Messrs. Purishkevich & Co.?

* The beginning of the article has not been discovered.—*Ed.*

That much is clear. All the activity of Messrs. Konovalovs—and, of course, not the Konovalovs alone, but all the liberals—has provided ample proof that the only means they regard as *available* are those which *do not undermine* the foundations of the welfare and the foundations of the privileges of Messrs. Purishkevich & Co.

There was need to attend the conference to expose for the thousandth time (we shall never tire of doing this) the fraud and to explain to the naive, or ignorant, or slow-witted democrats the "gist" (or, if you want the straight truth, the *dirt* and the *lie*) of the word "availability".

This is the basest, the most loathsome, the most corrupt word in the Russian political vocabulary. From the standpoint of grammar it is ridiculous to say: "I recognise only available means", for who does not know that the *unavailable* is not available? But the whole point is that the question is not a grammatical, but a political one. The workers do *not* regard as available the same things as Konovalov, Milyukov & Co. do.

Let me take a negative example. The workers consider *un*available "means" like declaring Rodzyanko's speech "constitutional" today, and tomorrow railing about the infamy of the Octobrists (who have remained true to themselves and to the Purishkeviches from October 17 or even earlier).

The workers, a fact I am quite sure of, consider that means and that method "unavailable" villainy. The KonovaIovs and the Milyukovs consider it "available" "constitutional tactics".

Let me now take a positive example.... On second thoughts ... Article 129.... Now, gentlemen, after all you must allow me *not* to take any positive example in this article, in this newspaper or in this magazine! On the other hand, if I had been at the conference, and if the Konovalovs and the Milyukovs at the conference had promised not to inform on me, I would have cited a positive historical and statistical example that would be fine, excellent, vivid and most convincing!... Upon my word, it is a temptation to describe what is considered available in the sphere of action in general and in the sphere of the *purse*, in particular, by the workers on the one hand, and by the Konovalovs and the Milyukovs on the other.... But I shall refrain....

One should have attended the conference. It could have offered more freedom of speech than "certain other places". There the democrats should have been invited to speak out on the harm of reformism—this would have been opportune from the standpoint of the question that has been raised. There would have been *two* resolutions: the democratic and the liberal, one "unavailable" to the liberals (but available to the workers and the class-conscious petty bourgeois, or at least to a section of them) and the other "available" to the Konovalovs. The public would have read both resolutions or would have heard about both of them and would have *given them thought*. It would have thoroughly scrutinised them. It would have used its brains. People would have started to make comparisons.

And surely within a short while, the democracy which believes liberal villainy "unavailable" and regards something quite different as available would have started to *split away* from the section of democracy which is captivated by liberal catchwords and empty phrases. That, *too*, would have been "joint action"—but not in the spirit of common talk with the liberals concerning the limits of what is "available" to liberalism.

Yes, indeed, the newspaper *Luch* is being run by loathsome liberals, but if it carries a few more useful leaders like the one in No. 189, the workers will finally find out these "evil pastors". Carry on, gentlemen, and Godspeed!

Written not earlier than May 10 (23), 1913
Signed: *P o s t o r o n n y*

First published in 1961 in Vol. 23 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

LANDOWNERS ON THE MIGRATION OF AGRICULTURAL LABOUR

Novoye Vremya, a newspaper of the Black-Hundred landowners, reports some interesting discussions among landowners in Poland and in the frontier areas of Russia in general over the migration of agricultural workers to Germany and other European countries in search of employment.

This migration has been rapidly growing. In 1901, some 218,000 persons a year were estimated to have migrated. In 1911, the figure was set at 740,000, more than three times the 1901 figure. In 1912, as many as 800,000 must have left.

Let us note that apart from Polish peasants and workers, Russian workers from the centre of Russia have been also leaving for Germany. "Now one very often meets men from Tula, Orel and Ryazan on the border and beyond." The issue of *free* ten-month foreign passports for workers going to do agricultural work has intensified this movement.

What is the cause? It is that the Russian peasants are being increasingly ruined and it is ever harder to earn a living in Russia, because of the general stagnation of economic life, which is depressed by the serf-owners and lawlessness. Wages in Russia are being kept down at the low serf level.

In Russia, the annual agricultural wage averages 62 rubles; add to this 46 rubles' worth of food a year and you get wages totalling 108 rubles a year. In Germany, however, wages average *180 rubles* a year, i.e., just under *twice as much!!* (In Britain, let us note in parenthesis, agricultural labourer's wages come to 300 rubles a year, and in America, to 500 rubles.)

It is natural, therefore, that *hundreds of thousands* of workers are fleeing from lawless, starving and impoverished Russia to find employment in Germany, and even beyond it—in Denmark, Switzerland and France. There the workers find out about a higher level of culture, much better cultivation of the soil, incomparably higher crop yields and, what is most important, political freedom, freedom for the labour press and labour organisations.

And so, we find the landowning gentlemen debating between themselves: some say that the landowner will benefit from this massive training of our workers in better methods of agriculture. Others wax indignant over the fact that the migration of workers tends to raise wages in the places which they leave.

In Russia, generally speaking—and in Russian legislation in particular—the opinion of *the latter* prevails, and they would like to see the peasants "settled" (i.e., tied to the land), submissive (without any prospect of moving), down-

trodden and barbaric (to prevent them from seeing how to improve their living conditions and how much better off workers in other countries are).

Fortunately, these landowning serf-masters, however hard they may try to break and distort Russian life, no longer have the power to stem the tide of world-wide capitalism, which is uprooting the Russian muzhik as well from his godforsaken hole.

Written on May 10 (23), 1913
Published on May 18, 1913 in *Pravda* No. 113
Signed: *D.*

Printed from the *Pravda* text

WORKING-CLASS PARTY AND LIBERAL RIDERS

(ON POTRESOV)

...* Mr. Potresov quotes (rather distorts) G. V. Plekhanov's article which appeared in August of 1905. At the time, there was a complete and formal split between the Bolsheviks, who united at the Third Congress of the Social-Democratic Party (London, May 1905), and the Mensheviks, (a "conference" at Geneva at the same time).[367] The Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks had their own separate press organs both in 1905 and in the spring of 1906.

These are all generally known historical facts, and the rider, Mr. Potresov, speculates on their being forgotten.

He has to *keep silent* about them because they expose the rider's impudence!

Neither of the then existing *two* Social-Democratic parties (and at the time Plekhanov was out of touch with both of them) had *any party* decision concerning the non-Party significance of (G. V. Plekhanov's article, or its liquidationism, its destruction or denial of the Party!

That tells the whole story, Mr. Dodging and Hiding Liberal Rider.

Liquidationism is a *trend* condemned by formal *Party* decisions in December 1908 and again in January 1910 (*unanimously* by all trends).

---

* The first page of the MS. has not been found.—*Ed.*

No conference (or any other institution) of the Party *ever* "read" any liquidationism into Plekhanov's article. *That tells the whole story.* Mr. A. N. Potresov clutches at an old article and presents a sheaf of quotations in order to *hush up* the fact that the *whole Party* condemned him, Potresov, his liquidationist *trend*.

Riders from among the liberal intelligentsia, like Mr. Potresov, are full of a grand, aristocratic contempt for *working-class party* decisions. These riders ignore *party* decisions!

And the working-class party ignores the liberal *Luch* and the liberal Mr. Potresov, who "reads" liquidationism into Plekhanov's old articles, as Mr. V. Chernov used to "read" Narodism into Liebknecht.

Mr. Potresov is pathetic and ridiculous in his vain efforts to talk his way out of the fact that liquidationism has been condemned by the Party.

It is only idle talk on the part of Mr. Potresov and *Luch* about taking Plekhanov to *court*, it is only an effort to fool the reader. They are well aware that everyone will *b l a m e* them and will laugh at their vain efforts to accuse Plekhanov.

Written on May 27 (June 9), 1913

First published in full in 1961 in Vol. 23 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

CAPITALISTS AND ARMAMENTS

The British labour press is continuing its interesting and instructive campaign of exposure revealing how the syndicates of internationally associated capitalists are pushing the nations into war.

Take Nobel's *dynamite trust* (or syndicate). Its capital comes to the tidy sum of 30 million rubles. Last year, it had a net profit of 3.3 million rubles. Eleven per cent in net profit, not bad, eh?

In their annual report, the noble dealers in destructive materials modestly explain their success in this short phrase: "This year there was a high demand for military supplies."

Is it surprising? The capitalist press and the political leaders serving the capitalists have been shouting about war, and clamouring for more armaments—that is so profitable for the industrialists manufacturing military supplies!

But who are they, these industrialists?

They are the associated capitalists of *all* nations, the brothers of ministers, members of parliament and so on!

Among the shareholders of the "dynamite" trust (which is a shareholder, if not an owner, of *four* dynamite plants in Germany) we come across the following names:

German army: General von Mühlburg, Major Baron von Fritsch, etc.;

British army: General J. Donald, Colonel Noel Findlay, etc.;

French army: Colonel François Laffargue;

Lord Glenconner, brother of Mrs. Asquith, the *British Prime Minister's* wife, Sir North, a minister, Harold Tennant, M. P., Deutsche Bank, Hannover Bank, *etc.*

The leaders of the *national* parties in various parliaments who shout about the "might of the state" and about "patriotism" (vide the motion formulas of the Cadets, Progressists and Octobrists in the Fourth Duma![368]) realise this patriotism by arming France against Germany, Germany against Britain, etc. They are all such ardent patriots. They are all so concerned, oh, so concerned about the "might of the state"—their own, of course—against the enemy.

And so they sit alongside these "enemies" on the boards and at the meetings of shareholders of the dynamite and other trusts (syndicates), raking in millions of rubles in net profits and pushing—each one his "own" nation—into war against other nations.

Pravda No. 133, June 12, 1913

Printed from the *Pravda* text

CHEAP MEAT FOR THE "PEOPLE"

What a sensation! A most vital need of the workers is being satisfied! Cheap meat for the people—where? what? how?

Russkoye Slovo reports that the city slaughter-house in Moscow has opened a "Freibank", i.e., a shop for the sale

of cheap meat which has been rendered harmless and certified as relatively fit for use.

Cheap meat is a good thing. But what is the meaning of "rendered harmless", "*relatively* fit for use" (consequently, there would be equal reason to say "*relatively unfit for use*"!)? Here is what it means:

When animals are put up for sale, they are examined by veterinary inspectors. Sick ones are rejected. No permission is given to slaughter them, because their use for food threatens to infect humans with various diseases. Most rejected animals are tubercular and measly (worm-infected).

Of the total of about 450,000 head of cattle going through the Moscow slaughter-house almost 30,000 are rejected as *suspect*.

And so this suspect measly and tubercular cattle is rendered harmless by boiling in a special chamber under the supervision of a veterinary surgeon for about three hours. This boiling kills off the worms and the tubercular bacilli.

Well, apparently all, or almost all, die off or nearly die off! This yields cheap boiled meat that has been rendered harmless.

The people say, according to a comment in *Russkoye Slovo*, that "this meat won't kill you, but it may give you TB or stomach trouble, because, after all, the brutes were ailing."

The demand for this meat is heavy. Workers from the city itself go there and queue up for a long time. The morning queues consist mostly of women, housewives; the day queues, of workers, mainly builders.

The boiled meat that has been rendered harmless and that won't kill you but will give you stomach trouble is just right for the people. The people cannot afford real meat.

It is said that the more painstaking the veterinary supervision, the more meat is rejected. "So", *Russkoye Slovo* concludes, "the population have a twofold interest in thorough supervision: the middle classes want sound meat delivered from the slaughter-house; the poor, more cattle rejected and the Freibank kept well supplied with meat."

We certainly live in very civilised and philanthropic times: we have learned to make the population take a "twofold interest". And the "freedom" for cheap meat

is remarkable: after all, "Freibank" in German means "free shop".

Civilisation, freedom, cheap products, revival of trade—everything is for the people! Whenever you see an advertisement: "People's Quarters Society"—you can be sure that the cellar or garret will be cheap and under medical supervision: it won't kill you of course, but you will get TB.

Whenever you see a signboard: "People's Dining-Hall"—don't hesitate to go in. You will be served cheap boiled meat which has gone through the slaughter-house under supervision, and which has not gone through the slaughter-house without supervision.

Whenever you see a signboard: "People's Library"—you can afford to exult. There you will find cheap or even free pamphlets issued by the Union of the Russian People or the All-Russia Nationalist Club, under the medical supervision of the spiritual censorship.

It is being said that a "Freibank" is soon to be opened for the sale of "people's bread"—made of grass, which is boiled, rendered harmless and baked under veterinary, sorry, I mean medical supervision.

Civilisation, freedom, cheap products, revival of trade—everything is for the people! And the population will find itself with a growing twofold interest: the rich, to have their meat sound, and the poor, to have the "Freibank" well stocked with meat relatively fit for use.

Written on June 8 (21), 1913
Published on June 16, 1913 in *Pravda* No. 137
Signed: *V.*

Printed from the *Pravda* text

DRAFT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE R.S.D.L.P. C.C. AND THE PRIBOI GROUP ON ITS RECOGNITION AS THE R.S.D.L.P. C.C. PUBLISHERS[369]

Introduction X)) merits and important role.

I. In view of the advance of the business and the need for official recognition, it should be correctly constituted *as the C.C. Publishers* on the following principles:

a) the group shall autonomously conduct the administrative and organisational sector;

b) all books and material which are not urgent shall be submitted to the C.C. for preliminary review, and the urgent ones shall be published without such submission, but with the C.C. representative having the right of veto.

In the event of differences and the impossibility of agreement, the question shall be referred to the full C.C. collegium for the final decision.

The same full collegium shall decide the question of publishing pamphlets in the event of any differences between the C.C. representative and the Priboi collegium on the question of pamphlets coming in through the C.C. representative.

c) The C.C. appoints Comrade X to take charge of the financial side of its publishers.

August 7, 1913

First published in 1962 in the magazine *Istorichesky Arkhiv* No. 1

Printed from the original

THE OCTOBRISTS AND THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

The current political situation in Russia is of especial interest. The negotiations between the Cadets, the Progressists and the Octobrists on common "opposition" tactics in the Duma, on the one hand, and the working-class movement, on the other, testify not only to a "revival", but to something else as well.

One of the highly instructive documents of our interesting period is the appeal issued by the Central Committee of the Union of October Seventeen to party members, urging them (according to *Rech*) to "discard their apathy and set about working with vigour".

According to the Octobrist C.C., "now that the revolutionary forces are once again coming into motion, evidence of which is incidentally provided by the strikes, all high-

minded citizens sincerely desirous of the state's progressive development should join the Union of October Seventeen, thereby increasing its membership and enhancing its prestige".

The work of the Octobrists, their C.C. believes, should "paralyse the influence of the destructive elements who are again raising their voice in importunate and vociferous calls for another revolution in Russia's political and social system. The Central Committee gives a reminder of the sacrifices the state and society will have to suffer, if high-minded men now sit back and shun social activity. The Central Committee is sure that millions of loyal Russian citizens will not allow a handful of revolutionaries to ruin Russia".

That is how *Rech* (No. 275) reports the contents of the interesting appeal from the Octobrist C.C., without apparently finding any departures in it from normal Octobrist policy.

Let us examine the appeal of the Octobrist C.C. as a document characterising the history of our time. The Octobrists are invited to "discard apathy". This means that there has been apathy up to now, doesn't it? When the forces of reaction were triumphant, the Octobrists were apathetic. When *it looked* as if the forces of reaction would be adequate to maintain "order"—the Octobrists were satisfied and saw no need to "set about working". When the forces of reaction have proved to be inadequate (the forces opposed to the reactionaries "are once again coming into motion")—then ... then the Octobrists vigorously set about the business of *helping reaction*.

Indeed, is it not helping reaction for an influential Duma group to start bashing the "importunate and vociferous" Left-wingers, their desire to "ruin Russia"? Just think: a "handful" only, and they threaten to "ruin Russia"! The Left-wingers, whose newspapers (numbering at least a dozen all over Russia) are being confiscated almost daily, are remarkable, please note, for their "importunity and vociferousness"! And that, you will note, is a word-for-word repetition of the truly importunate and vociferous phrases which the reader will find any day in the Black-Hundred government press.

This gives us a picture of what the preaching of "progressive" ideas "in the spirit of the October 17 Manifesto" has

actually come to. As soon as the working-class movement gained in strength and brought about a general revival in social life, our bourgeois "Progressists" at once bared their teeth, *not* against reaction, but against the working-class movement.

Russia is again facing a balance of forces, similar to the one in evidence eight or nine years ago, but on an extended scale, over a wider field. At that time, the Octobrists, the Progressists and the Cadets were still undifferentiated and existed together as a united and ostensibly "leading society". It would appear that we now have *three* developed political parties of the bourgeoisie—the Octobrists, the Progressists and the Cadets—who have gone through and tried themselves out in three Dumas and in the eventful years from 1906 to 1912. There is an *ideal* division of labour between them: the Octobrists declare outright war on the Lefts and do so in the resolute Black-Hundred spirit; the Progressists *were in agreement* with the Octobrists yesterday, and today are doing the same thing, promising to pursue this respectable occupation for a long time; the Cadets, for their part, have also long been in "agreement" with the Progressists, friends of the Octobrists, assuring the people of their democratism, you will pardon the expression.

If the working-class movement eight years ago ignored all the Octobrist and the Cadet overt and covert betrayals and vacillations, there is good reason to believe that the workers have *not* grown more stupid since then.

Za Pravdu No. 10, October 15, 1913
Signed: *K - p o v*

Printed from the *Za Pravdu* text

ON THE "JUBILEE OF THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA"

The 50th anniversary of Moscow's liberal newspaper has evoked torrents of laudatory speeches from Russian liberals of every stripe. That is natural, legitimate and consistent. Liberals can be expected to celebrate the jubilee of the liberal newspaper. *Russkiye Vedomosti*[370] has been no worse than other liberal newspapers, and in some respects (as in

the abundance of *scientific* material) it has certainly been above the liberal average.

But when the rhetoricians of liberalism, Messrs. Kovalevsky, Milyukov, Manuilov, Bunin and their like, praise "*Russkiye Vedomosti*" *on behalf of democracy* and from an ostensibly democratic standpoint, that is a flagrant lie and it cannot be allowed to go unchallenged.

Distinguished and notable liberals! You all swear that you stand for political freedom. But you refuse to understand one simple fact, namely, that a liberal society in Russia which allows counter-revolutionary statements by liberals to go unchallenged, does not deserve political freedom and will never get it.

You are celebrating the 50th anniversary of *Russkiye Vedomosti*, aren't you? That's fine. In that case, do not hide *the truth*, do not forget that *Russkiye Vedomosti* was one of the first liberal newspapers to trip up the first serious and deep-going mass movement in Russia, whose aim was to attain political freedom.

That was in the *summer* of 1905. The leading light of liberal science and liberal publicism, Mr. Professor Vinogradov the historian, then contributed to *Russkiye Vedomosti* a remarkable, unforgettable, and memorable "historic" article. His main idea was as follows: let's hope our movement does not go beyond the German one of 1848-49, otherwise the Prussian watchman will have to restore order over here.

That's the kind of thing *Russkiye Vedomosti*, organ of the liberals, printed in the summer of 1905!!

Let everyone in Russia who wants to gain a reputation for being a democrat ponder this historical fact. History has proved—and its proof is irrefutable—that the movement in the *autumn* of 1905 was weak and inadequate, while a famous liberal found it much too strong in the *summer* of 1905, and put spokes in its wheels.

The fact is there. It is incontrovertible. This liberal and all his fellows, all his—you will pardon me the expression—fellow-politicians among the liberals *bear* the moral and political *blame* for the Jewish pogroms in the autumn of 1905. For, incidentally, the pogromists drew for strength and impudence on precisely this "Vinogradov"-type mood of liberal society.

The "Vinogradov"-type liberals have the government they *fully* deserve. The "Vinogradov" liberal writing in *Russkiye Vedomosti*, and Purishkevich, the collective Purishkevich, are only two sides of the same medal, they are interconnected and interdependent phenomena.

There *can* be *no* political freedom in Russia until she has (or because she lacks) mass democracy with a clear understanding of the total short-sightedness, absurdity and vileness of the "Vinogradov"-type liberalism of *Russkiye Vedomosti*.

Za Pravdu No. 10,
October 15, 1913

Printed from the
Za Pravdu text

DRAFT RESOLUTION BY WORKERS' ORGANISATIONS ON THE SLANDEROUS LIQUIDATORS' CHARGE AGAINST INSURANCE WORKER X[371]

Having examined the liquidators' charge in their *Novaya Rabochaya Gazeta* against insurance worker X, and having obtained all the testimonials from the Editorial Board of the liquidators' newspaper and from the Editorial Board of *Za Pravdu*, which on October 17 published the decision of a commission from *five* Marxist institutions, we, the board of such and such a league or society, find this decision correct and the liquidators' campaign slanderous.

We urge workers, in order to safeguard their organisation from ruin, to boycott the slanderers, unless they make a firm and public retraction of their slanders.

Written not earlier than October 19
(November 1), 1913

First published in 1965
in Vol. 54 of the Fifth Russian
edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from
the original

RUSSIAN WORKERS' ASSESSMENT OF THE SPLIT IN THE DUMA SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC GROUP

Both Social-Democratic newspapers in St. Petersburg, which express the views of the liquidators and the pro-Party men, carry statements by workers' groups from all

over Russia. In these statements, the workers define their attitude to the two Social-Democratic Duma groups: 1) the Social-Democratic group (7 deputies + Jagiello), and 2) the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group—6 Social-Democratic workers' deputies.

We are now in a position to sum up the exact results of the workers' decisions, according to the data in both newspapers, for a whole month, from October 20 to November 20, old style.

The most exact workers' statements, never once questioned by either side, are the resolutions with a definite number of *signatures*. The overall result, for the whole of Russia (not only the Caucasus, but also the Bund and the Latvians have a special representation on the International Socialist Bureau), is: **4,850** for the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group (6 deputies) and **2,539** for the Social-Democratic group (7 deputies + Jagiello).

Trade unions, as represented by their boards (for police reasons the names of the trade unions in Russia are not published) = 9 unions with 13,500 members, for the 6 deputies; and one union with an unspecified membership, for the 7 deputies.

Written between November 20 and December 1 (December 3 and 14), 1913

First published in 1961 in Vol. 24 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

OUTLINE OF A REPORT TO LOCAL ORGANISATIONS ON THE PORONIN JOINT CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. C.C. AND PARTY FUNCTIONARIES (1913)[372]

Outline of a Report to Local Organisations

December 12

General theme—events of the strike movement and Party life since the summer of 1913. Conference resolutions. In particular, the following points are brought out:

1. A general strike on January 9, 1914. Conference decision. Necessity of the strike. Its slogans (democratic republic.

8-hour working day, confiscation of landed estates). Intensified preparations for the strike.

2. *Insurance campaign*. More extensive circulation of the magazine *Voprosy Strakhovaniya*.[373]—Formation of Party cells inside *all* societies and *all* boards. Getting our own, Party, majority on the boards (also in trade unions, clubs, etc., etc.).

3. *The Six* and *the Seven*. The main reasons for the split: (a) liquidationism = destruction of the Party. Struggle *over that*. The Seven *incline* to liquidationism; (b) the Seven *do not recognise* Party decisions; (c) the *majority of the Party* has been proved to back the Six. Main figures from *Pravda*. Issues with *material* on the question of the split should be on hand. (Resolutions for the Six should be *p r e s s e d* forward.)

4. Party congress. Necessity of it. Participation in it of *all* illegal Party cells. Its preparation: *m o n e y* is the main thing. Collection of *fund* for congress (mainly through the deputies). The task for each group or union of groups is by the spring to collect *double the amount* of expenses (expenses per delegate—150 rubles. Each group or union of adjacent groups must collect 300 rubles).

5. The need to develop ties—to strengthen them (teaching correspondence with the St. Petersburg Bureau and the Bureau Abroad). The correspondence is weak: *that is why transport* is poor. There must be agents everywhere.

6. A review of the main points from the resolutions of the conference. For instance, on the national question: (a) struggle against every brand of nationalism, even the refined one (cultural-national autonomy); (b) unity of workers of *all* nationalities; (c) struggle against *Great-Russian* Black-Hundred nationalism. (Idem briefly about the other resolutions.)

7. Legal and illegal press. Increase collections. The legal press will inevitably *go down*: concentrate efforts on creating an illegal one (see "Announcement", pp. 9-10 especially).

Written on November 29
(December 12), 1913

First published in 1923 in the book
Iz epokhi "Zvezdy" i "Pravdy"
(*1911-1914*) (From the *Zvezda* and
Pravda Period), Part III

Printed from
a copy written
in N. K. Krupskaya's
hand

ON THE QUESTION OF THE BUREAU'S NEXT STEPS

A number of groups abroad, big, small and tiny, are making a lot of noise over the forthcoming sitting of the International Socialist Bureau on December 1 (14).[374] By the time Tuesday's edition is out there will perhaps be some news, by cable, of the Bureau's decision. I believe it to be my duty, therefore, to describe the state of affairs so as to prevent any false rumours and to make it possible to adopt the right tone at once.

The small and tiny groups abroad, who have no support in Russia (like Rosa Luxemburg and the Tyszka people, or Charles Rappoport, who recently wrote in a small French paper in the same spirit, or Alexinsky and the *Vperyod* group in Paris, etc., etc.), all these little groups are straining hard to have the Bureau take a vote for "unity".

Of course, we too want unity!! The efforts of the little groups are a pathetic move to protect the liquidators. This move of theirs will fail: they will make a fuss and that's as far as it will go.

What decision will the Bureau take? That is, of course, something we don't know. But we were told by a *very prominent* member (or even a group of members) that *for formal reasons* the idea is to admit the liquidator O.C., *instead of* Plekhanov, and from the Duma group, *only* the Seven, or rather the Eight. These formal reasons are as follows: the parliamentary groups in every country do *not* represent the parties, but *only themselves*, let us say there are eight Socialist-Revolutionaries and seven Social-Democrats—then *only* the eight S.R.s. are sent in. Since that is so (that will be verified), nothing can, of course, be done *for the time being*. Let the liquidators throw out Plekhanov—we shall see *whether this is going to do them any good*!!! I am sure that it will *not*.

That is why I strongly suggest that there should be no nervousness or excitement, either over the rumours being spread by the liquidators, or over any possible Bureau decisions. We have taken steps to have the reports on *Russian* affairs from London written *through us* (about non-Russian affairs directly to you)—*calmly* wait for them and you

will find that there was no need for any trip and that neither the barking nor the Bureau will rescue the "drowning men" (the liquidators).

There is *private* information that Plekhanov is not going.

This should not be printed just yet. I repeat: calmly wait for reports from *your own* correspondent.

Written not later than
December 1 (14), 1913

First published in 1961
in Vol. 24 of the Fifth Russian
edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from
the original

THE POVERTY OF THE PEOPLE'S TEACHERS[375]

In view of the All-Russia Congress on Public Education to be held in December, it is appropriate that we should turn our attention to an old question which is perpetually new: the poverty of the people's teachers.

We have before us Volume I of the *One-Day Census of Primary Schools in the Empire*. The volume has been published by the Ministry of Public—what you might call—Education. It is signed by the well-known statistician Mr. V. I. Pokrovsky.

The bureaucratic character of this official work—bureaucratic and official in the worst sense of the words—instantly leaps to the eye. The census was taken on January 18, 1911. It took all of two years to publish its first volume dealing only with the gubernias of the St. Petersburg academic district! The only thing we seem to be able to do in our country without tedious, agonising red tape is to pass laws, like the law against the press.

As is the practice, the census programme was repeatedly discussed throughout 1910 by a host of official cabinets and conferences, each of which did something to spoil it. As a result, for instance, there is only one head, "Russian Language", on the question of the pupils' mother tongue; it is clearly prohibited to make the subdivision into Byelorussian, Little Russian (Ukrainian) and Great Russian. As a result, the census of the schools of the Empire *does not*

include a number of schools, such as the urban schools set up under the 1872 statute, private first- and second-category schools, etc.

It is prohibited to collect full data. It is prohibited to know the truth about the language spoken by the pupils at home. It is prohibited to make a comparison between public and private schools.

The man who compiled these statistics, Mr. Pokrovsky, much vaunted by the liberals, has done his bit to *spoil* the census returns. Thus, material has been separately collected on each teacher relative to the size of salary. It is, naturally, important to know the truth on such a burning question as the poverty of the people's teachers. It is important to know just *how many* masters and mistresses are receiving the desperately low, the very lowest, the very low and the low salaries in general.

The material on this has been collected. The information on it *is there*. But our liberal statistician "processes" it in such a way as *to cover up the unsavoury truth*.

Our statistician merely informs us of the *average* salaries of masters and mistresses by gubernia and the different categories of schools. The official classifications are scrupulously observed. But anyone who wants to know the truth is not interested in which gubernia and in which category of schools the teachers starve, but *how many* teachers are starving and living in poverty. It was quite possible to determine from the returns of the census *how many* teachers are being paid starvation salaries (say, under 360 rubles, from 360 to 400 rubles, etc.), and this should unquestionably have been done. But it has not been done. It has been buried in the hundreds of thousands of cards at the archives.

What the public has been informed of is only the officially purged and officially embellished averages of salaries by category and gubernia.... Need we say, too, that the liberal statisticians made a point of concealing from the public what percentage of the starving teachers have families.

These "average" figures show that a schoolmistress (in the St. Petersburg academic district) receives 433 rubles a year, and a schoolmaster, 376. But most of the teachers are in the countryside. There "average" salaries are 347 rubles for the schoolmistress, and 367 rubles for the schoolmaster. (Let us

note that the overall number of schoolmistresses is double that of schoolmasters).

Most of the teachers of the St. Petersburg district are *outside* St. Petersburg Gubernia. The salaries of schoolmistresses are: Olonets Gubernia—375 rubles; Novgorod Gubernia—358 rubles; Vologda Gubernia—320 rubles; Archangel Gubernia—319 rubles; and Pskov Gubernia—312 rubles.

Even these figures, which put a gloss on reality, make it clear that the *majority* of schoolmistresses are paid a starvation salary. With the present high cost of living the *26-30 rubles* a month for schoolmistresses, of whom (on average again) 11.5 per cent are married and 4.4 per cent are widows, is undoubtedly a beggarly salary which condemns teachers to starvation and indigence.

From the "category" data we find that 2,180 schoolmistresses worked in parish one-class schools (in the St. Petersburg academic district, with a total of 7,693 schoolmistresses). Consequently, we have here a "category" with a highly impressive number of teachers. What then are they paid?

An average of 302 rubles in the towns, and 301 rubles in the villages.

The Russian state spends hundreds of millions of rubles on the maintenance of its civil service, the police, the army, etc., while dooming teachers in the people's schools to starvation. The bourgeoisie "sympathises" with public education—with the proviso, however, that the teachers live in worse conditions than the servants in the manor-houses and the houses of the rich....

Za Pravdu No. 51,
December 4, 1913

Printed from the
Za Pravdu text

RUSSIAN WORKERS AND THE INTERNATIONAL

In this issue of our newspaper comrades workers will find a detailed account of the recent sitting of the International Socialist Bureau in London, and also its resolution on the question of unity of the Social-Democratic forces in Russia.

Class-conscious workers throughout Russia must discuss this resolution with the utmost attention.

A class-conscious worker feels and realises himself to be not only a member of the *Russian* Marxist family—he is aware that he is also a member of the *international* family of Marxists. He also has duties to the workers' International. He must take account of the opinions and wishes of the latter. He must not lose touch with the international workers' army for a single moment.

Russian Marxist workers will welcome the fact that the workers' International has shown a desire to make a serious study of the principled discussions which have such a prominent part to play in our Russian working-class movement. The accursed conditions of Russian social and political life have led to a state where our comrades know much less about our movement than about the movement in any other country. This lack of knowledge about the real state of affairs in Russia is such that just recently German Social-Democratic spokesmen proposed the convocation of all circles of Russian Social-Democrats abroad (12 "trends" abroad) to work out a new programme for the Party.* But, after all, everyone knows that the Russian proletariat worked out such a programme back in 1903....

This period is, fortunately, about to end. By its great and heroic struggle, the Russian proletariat has made itself a talking point throughout the civilised world. The working class of Russia has by rights taken up its place in the workers' International, and it is safe to say that with every passing year its role in the international arena will be ever bigger and more important.

The decision of the International Bureau gives Russian workers their first chance to acquaint our West-European comrades with the basic substance of our discussions. The Bureau has put the question like this: 1) it has offered its good offices to bring about unity; 2) it believes the actual differences must be brought out; 3) therefore it has authorised its Executive Committee to contact and arrange an exchange of opinion with all Social-Democrats accepting the Social-Democratic programme and also those whose programme is close to the Social-Democratic.

Russian Marxists find all this quite acceptable.

---

* See this volume, pp. 274-77.—*Ed.*

It is indeed extremely desirable to *bring out* the differences. And even not only those between the Marxists and the liquidators, but also those between the Marxists and the Narodniks, and the Zionist Socialists (whom we regard as being not much worse than the Bund and the P.P.S.), etc. It would be a considerable success if the International Bureau managed to secure clear cut and precise formulations and to establish the actual basis of the political differences.

But to clear up the differences does not at all mean to eliminate them. The differences stem from the absolutely divergent views of the present epoch in Russia. They constitute *two* tactics, *two* systems of policy—the proletarian and the liberal. Nothing will eliminate this divergence.

But even there it is extremely desirable to have a precise and definite elucidation of *the terms* for unity put forward by each of the sides.

Marxist workers are faced with this important task: they must have a thorough discussion of the International Bureau's proposal and give it every possible attention, outlining their own terms of unity.

These terms are clear. They flow from the whole course of the working-class movement. The liquidators must *in fact* recognise the Marxist whole, they must recognise that the main slogans for agitation among the masses are the three old and basic demands; they must withdraw their amendments to the programme (cultural-national autonomy); they must refrain from shouting about the "strike itch"; condemn the Bundists' separatist strivings and demand local mergers; condemn the malicious personal attacks which poison the ideological struggle, etc. In the sphere of Duma activity, the Seven must unconditionally recognise their subordination to the Marxist whole and retract their anti-Party decisions (Jagiello, abolition of the programme, etc.). Even Comrade Plekhanov, who disagrees with us on many points, says in his letter to the International Bureau that "our Duma group is divided in consequence of certain regrettable decisions adopted by our comrades liquidators, who find themselves in a majority of seven to six".

It has not yet been cleared up whom it would be useful for the International Bureau to contact for arranging the general exchange of opinion. It is clear that there are two possible ways: either invitations should go out to representatives of the two principal trends: Marxists and liquidators, or to "all Social-Democrats", and all who regard themselves as being close to the Social-Democrats, in which case it would mean the party of deputy Jagiello (P.P.S.) and various Jewish socialist groups, and those of the Narodniks who consider their stand close to the Social-Democratic programme.

Every class-conscious worker should take an interest in the question raised by the International Bureau. We urge all workers to raise this question at their meetings, circles, talks, rallies, etc., to discuss it, to adopt their resolutions and to publish their opinion in our newspaper.

It is wrong to think that this business is remote and has nothing to do with us. If the question is raised at the international congress in Vienna[376] (something Marxists would very gladly welcome), the International must know the opinion of the Russian workers, of the proletarian organisations operating in Russia, and not only of the isolated circles abroad.

Comrades! Discuss this important question, adopt your decisions and communicate them to your newspaper, *Proletarskaya Pravda*. The class conscious workers of all countries will listen to what you say.

Proletarskaya Pravda No. 2, December 8, 1913

Printed from the *Proletarskaya Pravda* text

HOW THE LIQUIDATORS ARE CHEATING THE WORKERS

The International Socialist Bureau has decided to take steps to clarify the differences between Russian socialists and to offer its good offices to unite their forces.

What have the liquidators made of this decision?

They have right away made use of it to *cheat* the Russian workers.

A solemn editorial article in No. 97 of *Novaya Rabochaya Gazeta*[377] says:

"By rejecting the demand of the 'Six' for special representation in the interparliamentary section, the International Bureau not only unequivocally condemned their break-away from the Social-Democratic group, but also gave a proper assessment of one of the main demands, whose rejection the six deputies tried to use as an explanation and justification of their walk-out."

That is *not true* from start to finish.

We noted this in No. 1 of our newspaper.[378]

The liquidators, caught red-handed, are trying to mislead the workers by continuing their lies.

We repeat that the International Bureau did not reject the demand of the Six. It did not condemn their "break-away". It did not even go into an examination of the dispute between the six and the seven deputies.

This is nothing but a liquidationist trick.

The liquidator gentlemen resorted to the same criminal method last year after the sitting of the International Bureau, when Mr. Martov attributed to the German Social-Democrat Haase words he had never said against the Bolsheviks, for which he was subsequently exposed in Haase's published statement.

Here is how the question of deputy representation stood in the Bureau. The representative of the Marxists merely said that the delegate of the Seven was elected only by the Seven and that the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group does not recognise him as its delegate. Comrade Huysmans, Secretary of the International Bureau, gave the following explanation. There are special rules on the interparliamentary section. According to the rules, where there are several separate socialist groups in a given parliament, representation is given only to the group which has more deputies; the rules take no account of which party the given parliamentary group belongs to and how many workers there are behind it. The point to note is that parties have their own special representation .

Under these rules, if there were, say, two groups in the Duma, six Social-Democrats and seven Narodniks, *only* the Narodniks would be given the vote in the interparliamentary representation.

Here is another example: Bulgaria. There, 19 Shiroki Socialists (opportunists) and 18 Marxists were elected to Parliament. The two constitute separate parties and have two separate groups in Parliament. Both parties also have separate representatives on the Bureau. But *according to the rules*, the parliamentary representation can go only to the Shiroki group of 19. That does not mean, in any sense, that the Bureau "condemned" the 18 Marxist deputies.

That was the formal side of the matter. Any view can be taken of the rules. But just now that's what they are. In these conditions, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group could not even present its demand.

What should the Seven have done if they wished to be honest? They should have waived the formalities themselves. It has now been proved and recognised by everyone that several times more organised Social-Democratic workers are backing the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group than the Seven. The implication is clear. Those who wish to reckon with the voice of the workers, those who talk so much about unity, should in that case have done more than take the strictly formal approach.

However, the Seven capitalised on their "luck" under the rules. They have once again issued a challenge to the Russian workers. What is more, the liquidator gentlemen also began to tell lies about the International allegedly "condemning" the Six, etc.

That was the first response on the part of the liquidator gentlemen to the resolution of the International Socialist Bureau.

Marxist workers will respond to this liquidator fraud by publicly branding these gentlemen.

Comrades, you must continue your serious and thorough discussion of the Bureau's decision, voice your opinion and give the liquidators the response they deserve for their attempts to cheat the Russian workers.

Proletarskaya Pravda No. 3,
December 10, 1913

Printed from the
Proletarskaya Pravda text

RESOLUTION ON THE SOCIALIST BUREAU'S DECISION

We warmly welcome the decision of the workers' International concerning the need for full and final clarification of the substantial and basic differences existing in Russia between the political trends participating in the working-class movement.

In response to the International's proposal we believe it necessary, for our part, to outline the basic differences which, in our opinion, divide the Marxists and the liquidators into two irreconcilable camps.

We declare, first of all, that for any class-conscious worker it is not a matter of setting up some new entity, but merely of strengthening and fully restoring the old organisation as it took shape more than 15 years ago—with its old programme and its most important tactical decisions. The liquidators have split away from this Marxist organisation. These are the necessary conditions for restoring unity with them in the sphere of work *outside the Duma*:

1) Full and unconditional recognition (in fact) of "the underground", unconditional subordination to the decisions of its cells and an undertaking not to allow, in any circumstances, any kind of attacks against it in the press.

2) Full and unconditional recognition of the fact that the main task of the epoch consists of the three principal demands put forward by the working class of Russia, performance of work in that spirit, and repudiation of the liberal-reformist preachings calling for abdication of the old tasks.

3) Retraction of all attempts to change the programme of the Marxists (cultural-national autonomy) and unconditional acceptance of the programme worked out in 1903.

4) Full subordination on questions connected with the strike movement to the decisions of workers organised on Marxist lines, and repudiation of the struggle against the so-called "strike itch".

5) Recognition in fact of the proletariat's *independent* tactics, and refusal to play down the tasks of the working class for the sake of blocs with the liberals.

6) Recognition that in the matter of work in the trade unions guidance should be taken from the decisions of the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart and the London Congress of Russian Marxists.

7) Repudiation of the principle of establishing workers' organisations on the national basis. Establishment of *united* organisations in Poland and the North-Western Territory. Fulfilment by the Bund of the decision on local mergers which has been repeatedly reiterated by Russian Marxists as a whole.

These are the terms for unity in the sphere of *Duma* activity:

I. Recognition that the group is an organ unconditionally subordinated to the organised will of the Marxist whole.

II. Retraction of all the violations of the programme (cultural-national autonomy, acceptance of Jagiello, etc.).

III. Condemnation of the splitting acts of the Seven, which have also been condemned by G. V. Plekhanov in his letter to the International Socialist Bureau.

As for the groups which it would be useful for the international Bureau to contact for arranging a general exchange of opinion, we demand, above all, that participation in it should be *confined exclusively* to representatives of workers' organisations existing in Russia, and should in no instance include any of the circles abroad which are not connected with work in Russia.

We furthermore believe that: 1) either invitations should go out *only* to the representatives of the *two* principal trends struggling in Russia, i.e., the Marxists and the liquidators, 2) or, if there is a desire to clarify all differences in general between the Russian Social-Democrats and those who regard themselves as Social-Democrats, invitations should go out without exception, to all workers' organisations operating in Russia and regarding themselves as being close to the Social-Democrats. In that case, there is no reason to exclude some of the Left-wing Narodniks, or the Jewish groups who regard themselves as socialists and who compete with the Bund, etc.

Finally, we feel sure that in order to throw a true light on the differences among Russian Social-Democrats, the foreign socialist press will make its pages available to res-

ponsible representatives of Russian organisations who—in contrast to émigré circles and irresponsible persons—could give the foreign comrades a precise idea of the ideological and political basis of the differences in the Russian working-class movement.

A group of organised Marxists

Proletarskaya Pravda No. 9, December 17, 1913

Printed from the *Proletarskaya Pravda* text

ABOUT OUR SCHOOLS

The all-Russia school census of January 18, 1911, makes it possible—despite the extremely bad processing of the data—slightly to lift the veil of official secrecy.

The only data available so far are those on the St. Petersburg academic district, separately for the towns and villages. Let us see on the basis of these data what our *parish* schools are like.

In the towns, there were 329 city one-class schools, 139 private third-category and 177 parish one-class schools. Let us compare the schoolmistresses' average salaries (the number of schoolmasters is quite small): city schools—924 rubles a year, private—609, parish—*302*.

Poor, starving schoolmistresses—that is what our parish schools are.

Let us see what the percentage of teachers with higher and secondary lay general education is. In the city schools—76 per cent, private—67 per cent, and parish—18 per cent!

Uneducated schoolmistresses (we say nothing as yet about the teachers of catechism)—that is what our parish schools are.

In the villages we have 3,545 Zemstvo one-class schools and 2,506 parish one-class schools. In the former, the average salary of schoolmistresses is 374 rubles a year, in the latter—*301 rubles*.

In the former, educated teachers (teachers in general) come to 20 per cent, *in the latter*—2.5 per cent—once again without the teachers of catechism.

These data give an idea of the plight of the parish schools!

The census has also collected data on the average number of square arshins* of floor-space and cubic arshins of air-space per pupil—i.e., the crowding of schools.

The Zemstvo schools have 2.6 sq. arshins of floor-space and 10.1 cu. arshins of air; the parish schools, 2.4 sq. arshins and 9.6 cu. arshins, respectively.

The floor-space should be six times the light area of the windows. Actually, it is nine times greater, i.e., the schools are not only crowded, but also *dark*.

These data are, of course, extremely meagre. The Ministry tried very hard to *prevent* the collection of detailed, precise and full data on the beggarly condition of our schools.

Even so, the beggarly condition of the parish schools stands out in these incomplete, officially curtailed and poorly processed data.

One of the vital tasks before the representatives of workers' cultural and educational and trade union organisations at the forthcoming All-Russia Congress on Public Education is to make a comprehensive presentation of the question and to shed every possible light on the condition of our schools and schoolteachers.

Proletarskaya Pravda No. 10,
December 18, 1913

Printed from the
Proletarskaya Pravda text

THE DUMA GROUP AND THE MAJORITY OUTSIDE

Lomtatidze's letter on the struggle between the Six and the Seven in the Duma group was curiously run in the liquidators' newspaper alongside the calculation that 3,701 persons came out in favour of the liquidators (No. 75, p. 2). We leave the verification of this figure for another article, merely noting that *three days* earlier *Za Pravdu* (No. 26) reported the figure of 5,000, which has not been refuted by our opponents.

The Seven have been clearly shown *again and again* to represent a minority of the workers.

---

* Arshin = 28 inches.—*Ed.*

That is why Lomtatidze's "tough words" make an especially awkward impression. It is a sign of extreme weakness and impotent irritation to call names, to give a reminder of various episodes of the old and most embittered struggle, and to shout: "This is impudent, absurd, cynical", etc., etc.

It remains an unrefuted and incontrovertible fact that 1) the majority of class-conscious workers are backing the Six; and that 2) the Seven *refuse to recognise* the will and the decisions of the majority, and also refuse to recognise the governing institution accepted by the majority.

One feels a sense of embarrassment and shame for the irritated Lomtatidze, when he says:

"Have they (the Six) indicated a single instance in which the political actions in the Duma have run counter to the interests of our cause, our slogans and our traditions?"

Lomtatidze's lofty tone makes a false impression, once we are aware that not only the Six, but the highest governing institution, which they recognise, have long since *indicated* officially and in formal terms the *violation of the programme* by the Seven, to cite an instance!

With his clumsy irritation and his irrelevant questions, Lomtatidze merely underscores the really profound *essence* of the entire conflict—the fight of *non-party men* against the *Party principle*. That is the essence. Nor is it a joke or a trifle but the most serious and painful question.

Not everyone who says: "Lord! Lord!" will enter the kingdom of heaven! Not everyone who beats his breast and shouts "unity, unity" is actually working for unity.

What is working-class unity?

It is above all and chiefly unity of its political organisation, of its entity. *That* is the only kind of unity that can ensure real unity of the Duma group and of all the action and struggle of the working class in general.

That is the unity the liquidationist trend has violated, as the Party's official resolutions have repeatedly recognised since 1908. That is the crux of the matter. In evading it, Lomtatidze merely reveals his error.

The Seven are entirely to blame for the split, because *they* have violated the programme, *they* have come out in defence of the liquidators, who were destroying the Party, *they* have ignored the formal decisions of the majority, and

they have been violating the will of the organised workers. There is no other way out for them but to recognise their fault, accept the Six as representatives of the majority and start systematically moving closer to them through an agreement.

Proletarskaya Pravda No. 17,
December 29, 1913
Signed: *I.*

Printed from the
Proletarskaya
Pravda text

THESES FOR A LECTURE ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION[379]

National Question

(Theses from Memory)

A) Importance of the national question at the present time.
B) Place of national movements in history (resp. historical approach to the national question).
C) Two theories on the national question.
D) Self-determination of nations.
E) Equality and guarantee of minority rights. Autonomy.
F) Cultural-national autonomy.
G) National principle in Party organisation.

A. Introduction.

Importance of the National Question at the Current Historical Moment

1. Government's nationalism. All counter-revolution is dyed in nationalistic colours.
2. Idem—bourgeois liberalism (Struve & Co.).
3. With incredible, unprecedented oppression of non-Russian nations (57 per cent of the population of Russia)—nationalism in oppressed nations (pan-European fight).
4. Breach of R.S.D.L.P. programme (distortion of self-determination + cultural-national autonomy).
5. Split of Jewish separatism. National isolation.

B. 6. National question must be viewed historically and economically. National question is a *world-wide* phenomenon.

7. Epoch of national movements—end of Middle Ages and start of new period, epoch of *bourgeois-democratic* revolutions. At the time, national movements ***everywhere.***
8. Economic foundations? Capitalism demands consolidation of domestic market. The market is the centre of commercial relations. *Language* is the chief instrument of human commercial relations.
9. Consolidation of national areas (restoration of language, national awakening, etc.) and establishment of *national state*. Economic necessity of it.
10. Political superstructure over the economy. Democracy, sovereignty of nation. *Hence*, "*national state*"....
11. National state is *the rule throughout the world* (K. Kautsky in I, 18*, pp. *23* and *23-25*, *Internationalität*), while "*state of nationalities is the exception*".[380]

    K. Kautsky about O. Bauer: Bauer *underestimates* the urge for national state.

    ("the strength of the Drang") NB

    > In brackets: some people believe that the national state means *greater* nationalism than cultural-national autonomy. That is a naive and ridiculous delusion! The national state is the rule in the record of world history. Cultural-national autonomy is an invention of rather poor intellectuals which has not been realised anywhere.

12. Epoch of national (bourgeois-democratic) revolutions of the nineteenth century (Italy, Germany). It is over in Western Europe. *It has just started in the East and in Asia*....

C. Two theories of Marxism on the national question.

13. Emergence of proletarian parties in national states.

---

* Reference to p. 18 of the first notebook on the national question.—*Ed.*

Backward East. "*Theories*" of national question. (Little attention given to *theoretical* basis. K. Kautsky+O. Bauer.)

14. *O. B a u e r*. Nation=Kulturgemeinschaft*. "National culture" slogan ((red thread)). The main thing is the national character. (Mass of reservations, but that is not important.)
    (Kautsky's assessment: Kulturgemeinschaft=O. Bauer's main mistake.)
15. "Socialism will put more emphasis on the principle of nationality" (O. Bauer I, 5**—p. *532 of his book*).
16. Bauer's basic mistake is refined nationalism, a nationalism which is clean, without exploitation and without fighting.

NB ||| Proudhon used to clean up, idealise and embellish capitalism, O. Bauer does the same to nationalism.

17. The policy of the ruling classes is "conservative-national", ours is "evolutionary-national" (O. Bauer).
18. "We are not satisfied with the old internationalism" (O. Bauer)
    (O. Bauer I, 6).
19. ΣΣ of O. Bauer
    (α) idealistic theory of nation
    (β) national culture slogan (=bourgeois)
    (γ) nationalism purified, refined, absolute, right up to socialism
    (δ) internationalism completely forgotten.
    Σ=*n a t i o n a l o p p o r t u n i s m* (Pannekoek).
20. Confused O. Bauer, exposed by *K. K a u t s k y*.
    (α) Eigentümlich und hinfällig*** in that O. Bauer keeps talking about national culture. (I, 17) (p. 15, *Internationalität*)
    (β) "Nie ist eine rein nationale Kultur weniger möglich gewesen" (ibidem, 15, *Internationalität*)****

---

* Cultural community.—*Ed.*

** Here and below the reference is to pages 5, 6 and 17 of the first notebook on the national question.—*Ed.*

*** Peculiarity and weak spot.—*Ed.*

**** "Never before has a purely national culture been less possible" (ibidem, 15, *Internationality*).—*Ed.*

displacement:

		Br.	Fr.	Ger.	
— Example:	1800:	20	—30	—30	(Σ= 80)
	1900:	125	—40	—70	(Σ =235)

((English, or perhaps + Russian, may be a world language))

NB (γ) "Our internationalism is not a special type of nationalism, differing from bourgeois by non-aggressiveness, equality, etc., but an economically and culturally united social organism" (ibidem, p. 17).

NB In O. Bauer this view has disappeared behind the "Betonung der nationalen Kultur".*

(δ) The nation is not Kultur-, not Schicksal-, but Sprachgemeinschaft.**

(ε) What O. Bauer has is "*more emphasis on the national aspect*"....

NB (ζ) ΣΣ (in K. Kautsky)—gewaltige Ueberschätzung des nationalen ... Momentes (**35**, *Internationalität*). Völlige Vernachlässigung internationalen.***

21. K. Kautsky has Sprache und Territorium**** historico-economic theory

then **national state**

—and in bourgeois-**democratic movement**

now **internationalism at present.**

NB

D. § 9 of the programme = political self-determination.

22. What it means in principle and as used by the whole of international democracy since 1848 = political separation, formation of national state.

---

* "Emphasis on national culture."—*Ed.*

** Not a community of culture, of destiny, but a community of language.—*Ed.*

*** Enormous exaggeration of the national ... aspect (85, Internationality). Complete neglect of the International aspect.—*Ed.*

**** Language and territory.—*Ed.*

23. What it means from the standpoint of the *history* of national movements throughout the world= establishment of national state.
24. Funny attempts to give this paragraph a different interpretation (ridiculous!)!! The *democratic principle* in the national question
(α) (α) is *indissolubly* bound up with the *historico-economic* conditions of national movements.
25. Departure from the democratic principle is betraying and forgetting the *whole* of history.
Bourgeois revolution incomplete.
(β) (β) Russia=national state at bottom, at base. the centre [Pskov— Rostov-on-Don]
Outlying areas—non-Russian.
Extreme oppression.
Incompleteness of bourgeois-democratic revolution, which is *impossible* without a national movement and the urge to set up *national* states in general.
26. Russia's international position: next to it is Austria
(γ) (γ) (with an unfinished bourgeois revolution in respect of the national question) and an awakened Asia (republican China).
Tsarism is the most reactionary state system. Hence the particular inevitability of the national movement, and the demand that the Great Russians recognise the right to self-determination.
27. Concrete example. Norway (six centuries under Denmark). At the beginning of the nineteenth century [epoch of Napoleonic wars] *handed over to Sweden* (under a treaty between Sweden, Britain and Russia). Taken through a *war* between the Swedes and the Norwegians.
Annexed by Sweden. Retained *complete* autonomy (parliament, army, taxes, duties, etc.). Decades of friction and fighting.
1905. Start of the great revolution in the east of

Europe—close by an *unfinished bourgeois-democratic revolution* in a neighbouring, West-European, very free state. Result? **Norwegian revolution of 1905.**

August revolution in Norway. Decision of the parliament (August 17, 1905). Agitation by priests and landowners in Sweden.

Referendum | 5 million Swedes. and 2 million Norwegians.

Treaty with neighbouring state. Peace and full completion.

Swedish worker's duty? Stand not only for freedom in general, not only for autonomy, but without fail, for the **r i g h t** to secede.

28. 1905. Finland and Poland.

Deals between the national bourgeoisie and the Russian bourgeoisie. Tasks of the class parties: struggle against nationalistic deals, for an *a l l i a n c e w i t h t h e r e v o l u t i o n a r y p r o l e t a r i a t i n R u s s i a.*

29. Result: (α) Importance of §9 from the entire history of national movement.
(β) National oppression in Russia under the national state at the base and national oppression in the border areas.
(γ) Unfinished bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia.
(δ) Russia's international position.
(ε) Independent decision on the question of secession, but there must be propaganda.

---

30. Special stand of P.S.D.

Development of capitalism has bound up Poland and Russia closely together. Lodz factories working for the Russian market. It is not our business to set up a new class state. Is that all?

(α) Failure to say: is the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia and in the *E a s t* completed? *N o.*

(β) The whole point is not Poland or her secession, but the *Russian muzhik*.
1863
November 1905
Rebuttal of the nationalism of the Russian muzhik is more than the demand for the non-oppression of nations, more than autonomy, it is, without fail, the **right to secede.**

To deny or weaken this is absurd and reactionary.

To deny the *right* to secede is to help tsarism and to *indulge* the Russian muzhik's nationalism. NB

(γ) Example: Marx's attitude to Poland (Lopatin) and to Ireland...[381]

Marx on Ireland. *No nation oppressing the freedom of another nation can be free.* NB

Whence the P.S.D.'s absurdity?
Inside-out nationalism.
Scared by the Papuans.
Cracow—an example.
Along the wrong line.
The history of the P.S.D.'s promotion of its absurd and reactionary idea.
1895: K. Kautsky
(α) Materialismus *einseitig**
(β) are you afraid of indulging the nationalism of the petty bourgeoisie? *You are helping the Russian reactionaries!*
1903. Second Congress committee vs. Warski.[382]

E. *Equality of nations and minority rights....*

31. No privileges for any nation or language.
That is necessary from the standpoint of elementary democracy and working-class solidarity.

* Materialism *one-sided*.—*Ed.*

32. State language. Why it is not necessary.
    43 per cent Great Russians
    17 per cent Little Russians
     6 per cent White Russians
    66
     6 per cent Poles
    72 per cent Slavs.
33. Example of Switzerland. Separate sheet.
    (α) Three languages (70-22-7 per cent).
    (β) Graubünden 100,000 inhabitants
    < 30,000 Romanics [1%] *
    to (γ) Minority rights and *fundamental law*.
    (δ) Specimen solutions for national question in *bourgeois* society.
    (Belgium, *Finland*, etc.) [Not inventions]
34. Regional autonomy and local self-government = general principle of democratic system. Borders? National + economic + traditional, etc.
35. Is it feasible? *Fortunatov versus Medem.*
    National centres should be assessed by territorial minimum, not maximum.
    Standpoint of Medem's "ungratified": absolute nationalism of petty national islets!!!
36. "If the economic bonds are to be broken" (Medem).
37. Guarantee of minority rights. Fundamental law of the state (cf. Brünn §4).
38. Medem's objections I, 2** NB))
39. Necessity for such a general, central law (cf. Switzerland).
40. The only guarantee is a generally democratic and *centralised* democratic system.

---

* See present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 20-21.—*Ed.*

** Reference to p. 2 of the first notebook on the national question.—*Ed.*

F. *Cultural-national autonomy.*

Terms:

{ extraterritorial / personal / national }

41. What is the plan? (1) Cadastre
(2) Sejm
(3) Compulsory taxation.

42. Austria's experience (Brünn).

Programme for cultural-national autonomy. Failure. Clericalism. Unfeasible.

Half-way programme adopted. *Absurdity* stands out *at once*.

43. Principles behind the plan.

(0) Absolute, purified nationalism. Brought to completion.

(α) *National culture* slogan. Reactionary bourgeois slogan versus working-class movement and internationalism.

National culture and international culture:

{ isolation — unity
union with the bourgeoisie, clericals, etc. — union with democracy and socialists of other nations.

N.B.:
National museum in Lvov = "national culture"!!

(β) "Exemption from competence." Utopia! Its petty-bourgeois basis. Invention of poor intellectual.

"No seizure, no victimisation, no struggle" (Medem). Cf. *K. Kautsky*.

(γ) National curias in education. Harm. Negroes in America.

(δ) Objective logic: "not instead, but together" with centralised democracy. Austria versus Switzerland.

(ε) Uneven class content of different nations.
Not division, but separation.

{muzhik nations
and towns}

(ζ) Jews—mainly traders.

Sophism of Bundists: we isolate for *pure* class struggle.

44. National autonomy for the Jews?
O. Bauer and K. Kautsky. "Caste."
Jewish contribution to world culture and *two* trends among the Jews.

45. In Russia Jews isolated as a caste.
Way out? (1) freezing isolation in one way or another
(2) bringing them closer to the *democratic* and *socialist* movement of the Diaspora countries.[383]

"Expelling the Jews from the ranks of nations"....

46. 10.5 million throughout the world. Two halves

Asher about Vienna—150,000.

47. *All* bourgeois parties of the Jews have adopted cultural-national autonomy in Russia
{+ petty-bourgeois democracy 1907
+ Bund? (*section*)}

What sort of grist has Bauer's (petty-bourgeois, opportunist) invention become?

G. National principle in the organisation of socialist parties.
Austria. Only since Wimberg (1907). (Otto Bauer. I, 7. **1907.**)
Otto Bauer I, 7 about her opponents
idem I, 8.*
Split and *collapse*. Czech separatists (1910 Copenhagen Congress) and their sympathies for the **Bund.**

* Reference to pp. 7 and 8 of the first notebook on the national question.—*Ed.*

Russia

"Federation of the worst type"[384] 1889-1903. Bund's withdrawal from the Party.
1903-1906.
1907-11. Medem separate sheet

Integration (Caucasus, Riga, Vilna).
Unity from below.

Language*:

1) Cf. spread of languages.

Liége: February 2, 1914
Rabinovich: National question = "invention".

Written between January 10 and 20
(January 23 and February 2), 1914

First published in 1937
in *Lenin Miscellany XXX*

Printed from
the original

INSERTION FOR N. K. KRUPSKAYA'S ARTICLE "ON THE QUESTION OF THE POLICY OF THE MINISTRY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION"

There are hardly any illiterates in the civilised countries. An effort is made to get the people into the schools. Everything is done to set up libraries. Over here, the Ministry of Public, what you might call, "Education" resorts to the most desperate efforts, to the most ignominious police measures to *hamper* the cause of education and to *prevent* the people from acquiring knowledge! Over here, the Ministry has *destroyed* school libraries!! No civilised country in the world still has any special rules *against* libraries, or such a foul institution as the *censorship*. But over here, apart from the persecution of the press in general, apart from the wild measures *against* libraries in general, rules which are a hundred times more restrictive are being issued *against*

* From here on the entry is in pencil on the back cover of the notebook. There is also this address: "Parvis St.-Grilles. Maison du Peuple. No. 15 10.00 ".—*Ed.*

the public libraries! This is an outrageous policy of *benighting* the people, an outrageous policy of the landowners, who want the country to become *barbaric*. Some rich men, like Pavlenkov, have donated money for public libraries. Now, the wild landowners' government has destroyed the libraries. Isn't it about time for those who want to *help* education in Russia to understand that the money should be donated not for the libraries which are under the Ministry and are due to be destroyed, but for the struggle for political freedom, without which Russia is suffocating in barbarism.

Written in January 1914
First published in 1961 in Vol. 24 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*
Printed from the original

THE FOURTH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS OF THE LATVIAN TERRITORY [385]

JANUARY 13-26 (JANUARY 26-FEBRUARY 8), 1914

1

REPORT OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE AT THE FOURTH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS OF THE LATVIAN TERRITORY

L e n i n (representative of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party). Comrade Braun said that there was no need to rummage in scrap paper, in old documents. That is right. Still, one must base oneself on documents and other evidence. A closer study of the R.S.D.L.P. activity over the last two years shows up the existence of liquidationism, which has hampered the re-establishment of the Party. Unless we make a study of the political causes of the Party split, we shall be unable to understand the present disarray. Erroneous trends were already pointed out at the 1908 Conference and later at the 1910 Plenary Meeting. On the one hand, there is otzovism, which has failed to understand the new conditions in Russia, and on the other, liquidationism, which either rejects the

Party or minimises the importance of the illegal Party. These trends arose under the influence of the bourgeoisie. Liquidationism is a broad phenomenon. As early as 1906, there appeared men among the Socialist-Revolutionaries (Narodniks) who tried to legalise the Party. That is a policy of adaptation we see the Cadets pursuing. The same spirit of time-serving prevails among the Social-Democrat liquidators. A strong party can be set up only in the struggle against this liquidationism. That was already clearly stated by the 1908 Conference. After the Plenary Meeting the Party split up. The Central Committee Bureau Abroad, failing to call a Plenary Meeting, was itself subsequently wound up. The Party had to be re-established in struggle against the liquidators, and that was done by the January Conference. It adopted a decision to the effect that the liquidators had to be fought in the workers' curia, but Comrade Braun called the decision Asiatic. However, such a decision is merely a more consistent conclusion from the resolution adopted by the Plenary Meeting. The January Conference was censured on every hand.

But what was the actual situation over this January Conference? If it had in fact been nothing but a conference of splitters, the whole Party should have rallied to prove that the Conference did not represent the Party. But that did not happen. Comrade Braun said: the broad masses are not following Lenin. But serious-minded persons do not decide matters in that way; the facts must be examined to their full extent. And what do the facts indicate? The data on the results of the elections in the workers' curia were published: at the elections to the Second Duma the Bolsheviks received 47 per cent of the votes, at the elections to the Third Duma, 50 per cent, and at the elections to the Fourth Duma, 67 per cent. These facts are incontrovertible, and prove that the decisions of the January Conference were correct. What the Conference decided was realised at the elections. The majority of class-conscious workers in Russia are following the Bolsheviks, and this proves that the struggle against the liquidators was necessary. Even the legal press now admits that the majority of the class-conscious workers are backing the Bolsheviks.

According to Comrade Braun, the August conference[386] adopted the demands he put forward: the democratic republic slogan and the need for an illegal party. Why, in that case, does Comrade Braun want to leave the Organising Committee set up by the conference? That is not evidence of political wisdom or steadfastness in political activity. Comrade Braun said that there were now only a few odd liquidators among the writers but that liquidationism as such no longer existed. But what then is the meaning of *Luch* attacking the illegal Party and fighting against the pro-Party men? The liquidators have failed to keep their promises to Comrade Braun: they did not support the democratic republic slogan and the need for an illegal party. The Latvians want to withdraw from the Organising Committee. That, too, shows that the August bloc was nothing but a fiction. It is ridiculous or even demagogic to talk of unity with the liquidators, until they abandon their present views and adopt views that are diametrically (completely) opposed to their present ones. There can be no unity so long as liquidationism remains what it is. Those who stand for a legal party will not unite with those who stand for an illegal one. There are now two parties, one real, the other fictitious. This fictitious party consists of a group of intellectuals whose attacks on the illegal Party merely disorganise the workers. *Luch* itself does not unite all the writers of the August bloc, but only the liquidators. The only thing to do about the liquidators is to fight them.

"Demagogy", "unity", "splitters", are only loud words and nothing more; even a parrot can mouth them. But let us look at the facts. In the course of a year, *Pravda* united almost 2,000 workers' groups, and *Luch*, only 550. The organ which stands for the illegal Party mustered four times more supporters than the "all trend" paper. The facts show that they, the Bolsheviks, united the majority of the Russian workers. This point was also made by the conference convened in summer.

Lenin is being rebuked for splitting the group. But, for a whole year, six deputies fought against liquidationism in the group. The majority is for the Bolsheviks, the Party is behind them. The group must submit to the Party majori-

ty and must act together with the Party. By failing to do so they place themselves outside the Party, by the side of the Party. It is everywhere established that the group must submit to the decisions of the party. We must have the same thing in Russia as well. The deputies of the Duma are not just Social-Democratic chatterboxes, but Party workers who must submit to the Party.

Everything that is behind the liquidators is fiction, phrase-mongering, name-calling. What has actually happened since the group split up? The six deputies have got 6,000 signatures, the seven, 2,000. Anyone can read about this in the press. Martov said that behind the Seven were Marxist institutions, but these are institutions which do not represent the mass of Party members, but are only a fiction.

The Bolsheviks stand for unity. But who are those people who are unable to join the illegal Party? The illegal Party must be united. It must be united from below. Fighting is the only thing that can be done against those who attack the illegal Party and belittle the importance of such a party. Let's have a guarantee that the illegal Party will remain intact, that the democratic republic slogan will not be stained—only then is unity possible at the top and at the bottom. I do not know about Asia, but in Europe splitters are those who refuse to recognise the majority. Splitters are a minority who refuse to submit to majority decisions.

First published on May 14, 1915
in Latvian in the newspaper
Strahdneeks No. 37 (Boston)

Printed from the
newspaper text
Translated from
the Latvian

2

SUMMING-UP SPEECH AT THE FOURTH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS OF THE LATVIAN TERRITORY

L e n i n. I am being attacked for "demagogic methods", for splitting, etc. But what have our opponents been doing? They have always thrown dirt at the Bolsheviks. You have an example in Martov's unseemly pamphlet.—I merely

expressed my opinion that the Bolsheviks would attend the conference of the International Bureau. But the decision is still up to the Central Committee, on which the workers are sitting. It is they and not Lenin that will decide this question. Those who say that there is no liquidationism, show little respect for the Congress. What liquidationism is has already been clearly stated in Party decisions since 1908. These decisions have not been revoked and they must be reckoned with. Liquidationist ideas are now being preached in the newspapers of the "August bloc". Supporters of the Organising Committee here insist that they are not opposing the Party, but what has their paper been saying? Such examples are numerous. The conciliator An wanted to come out against the no-Party agitation, but the Editorial Board refused to change its view. There can be no union with those who stand up for the views of the newspaper *Luch*. It is liquidationism to work for an "open labour party".—The conference which is being called should not be attended for the purpose of uniting with the liquidators, but for exposing them and proving that the August bloc is a fiction.—The liquidationist press has been narrowing down the slogans and curbing the revolutionary tactics. The liquidators have no illegal literature of any sort; only the Bolsheviks have such literature. The existence of Bolshevik organisations in Russia is evident from the last issue (31). The elections to the Fourth Duma have also shown that the overwhelming majority of the workers are behind the Bolsheviks. These are facts which everyone can verify. This is also evidenced by the financial support to the newspapers.—Cries about unity are not important in themselves. The ability to unite must be there. The Bolsheviks in Russia have united a majority, while the August conference; by contrast, has united nothing. Braun is pulling away from it, Trotsky is doing the same—the "August bloc" is falling apart. Buryanov, too, has not remained among the seven deputies.—To make union possible the liquidators must be condemned.

First published on July 24, 1915
in Latvian in the newspaper
Strahdneeks No. 63 (Boston)

Printed from the
newspaper text
Translated from
the Latvian

3

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS OF THE LATVIAN TERRITORY TO THE R.S.D.L.P.

Ziemelis's Resolution

1. There is an overriding need to unite all truly Social-Democratic forces and have strict Party unity in Russia, especially now that the working-class struggle has been steadily expanding. Such unity is possible only between Social-Democrats who in their activity recognise that:

a) at the present time the R.S.D.L.P. can exist only illegally and that all Social-Democrats must join the illegal Party organisation;

b) Russian Social-Democracy must conduct agitation among the masses in the spirit of the revolutionary demands of 1905, urging the workers to march in the van of the entire emancipation movement and to work for another revolution.

The Congress recognises that every town must have a *united Social-Democratic organisation* to include workers of all nationalities and to conduct work in all the languages spoken by the local proletariat. The Congress invites Social-Democrats of all nationalities to work vigorously for real proletarian unity, a unity which is truly solid and which is organised by the workers themselves from below.

2. For the last five years, the *liquidationist trend* has been the central question of the internal Party struggle. As early as the All-Russia Conference of 1908, before any splits had occurred, the Party resolved that it regarded liquidationism as an attempt by a section of the Party intelligentsia to liquidate the existing R.S.D.L.P. organisation and to substitute for it an amorphous association within a legal framework, regardless of anything, even if the price to be paid were patent repudiation of the Party's programme, tactics and traditions.

At the Plenary Meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee in January 1910, at which all directions and trends in the Party were represented, liquidationism was once

again *unanimously* condemned by the whole Party as a "manifestation of bourgeois influence on the proletariat", which was expressed in the rejection of the illegal Social-Democratic Party, the belittling of its role and importance, the attempts to curtail the programme and tactical tasks and slogans of revolutionary Social-Democracy, and so on.

The attempt on the part of the conciliators to unite with the liquidators at any price (the August 1912 conference) proved to be useless, and the uniters found themselves ideologically and politically dependent on the liquidators.

The Fourth Social-Democratic Congress of the Latvian Territory definitely condemns the liquidationist trend and resolves to recall its representative from the Organising Committee, which has failed to dissociate itself from the liquidators.

3. In order to conduct broad political campaigns, the Congress authorises the Central Committee to contact organisations whose political line coincides with the resolutions adopted at the Congress.

4. The Congress welcomes the initiative of the International Socialist Bureau in raising the question of unification in Russian Social-Democracy, and authorises the Central Committee to promote this through all relevant steps, while standing up for the views expressed in this resolution.

First published in 1957 (in part) in the magazine *Voprosy Istorii KPSS* No. 3

Printed from the original

RESOLUTION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE ON SETTING UP AN ORGANISATIONAL SECTION OF THE C.C. TO DIRECT ILLEGAL WORK[387]

In view of the conditions of secrecy, a special section of the C.C. shall be set up to provide direct guidance in illegal organisational work.

General meetings of the C.C. sections shall be held only in case of emergency, with special precautions of secrecy and only by agreement between the representatives of both sections. Ordinary relations shall be conducted through individual authorised persons.

The organisational section of the C.C. shall use the cover name of Workers' Co-operative Commission.

This section shall 1) direct the work of the St. Petersburg Committee, systematically helping it and restoring it in the event of arrests; 2) see that the work of all legal organisations is connected on Party lines; 3) find especially strict forms of secrecy to cover up illegal ties and undertakings; 4) unite work on the all-Russia scale, with regular contacts and visiting rounds; 5) take charge mainly of preparing a party congress for August 1914.[388]

The organisational section shall be appointed by the Russian collegium of the C.C. and shall consist of 3-5 persons with an equal or double number of candidates.

Written on April 2-4 (15-17), 1914

First published in 1957 in the magazine *Voprosy Istorii KPSS* No. 3

Printed from the original

REVIEW[389]

I. M. Kozminykh-Lanin. ***Overtime at Factories and Plants in Moscow Gubernia.***
Moscow, 1914. Price 1.00 ruble.

The recently published new statistical pamphlet by Mr. Kozminykh-Lanin examines the question of overtime, which is of exceptional importance for the Russian workers.

Let us note that the statistical data given by Kozminykh-Lanin relate to the year of 1908 only and apply exclusively to workers of Moscow Gubernia. Moreover, the 1908 figures must now be largely out of date, especially in view of the fact that 1908 was a year of industrial stagnation, and that it was followed by a year of industrial upswing, and a parallel and intensified demand for manpower. This,

for its part, was bound to lead to greater use of overtime in a number of industries.

The data given by Kozminykh-Lanin (a factory inspector in Moscow Gubernia) are undoubtedly of a semi-official character, they were collected through an inquiry among the employers, so that they should be taken with a grain of salt but must none the less be given the most serious attention. For one thing, the literature on the question is so scarce in Russia that every work must be made use of, quite apart from the fact that even these semi-official statistics yield a great deal that is highly interesting.

Mr. Kozminykh-Lanin carried out his inquiry among a total of 112,380 workers in 152 enterprises of Moscow Gubernia, mainly large-scale ones, with the textile industry being prevalent in the inquiry.

The figures given in the pamphlet indicate that overtime is not widely practised in the textile industry of the Moscow area. Thus, of the 59,000 workers engaged in the processing of cotton, covered by the inquiry, only 767 did overtime on holidays. Considerably greater numbers did overtime on weekdays (1,717), but even there the figure fluctuates between 1 and 2 per cent of the total. That is understandable, because technical requirements in the textile industry are such that at every given moment there must be a definite number of hands specified more or less in advance; and the main thing is that 1908 was less than favourable for the textile industry. Employers were frequently concerned in cutting back production, rather than in increasing the productivity of their enterprises through overtime.

The metalworking industry, another leading branch, presents a different picture. There overtime is widely practised, Sometimes involving up to 20 per cent of the total number of workers.

As for the duration of overtime, according to Kozminykh-Lanin's data, it generally fluctuates both for metalworkers and textile workers between 25 and 35 hours per worker doing overtime (counting work on both weekdays and holidays). This is a very high figure. The 30 hours of free time on average taken up by overtime earning naturally add up entirely to so much harm done to the worker's cultural and mental development.

Let us see what workers are paid for the plunder of their labour-in terms of brains, muscles and nerves.... Mr. Kozminykh-Lanin gives a very detailed calculation of the per-hour remuneration of workers for overtime in the several branches. We find that this work earns textile workers an average of only 15-16 kopeks an hour, rarely more than that. These rates are slightly increased towards April and September, and then decline again to 13 kopeks in December-February. The earnings are especially small at wool-weaving mills; thus, the average per-hour wage for March came to only 6.75 kopeks for Sunday and holiday work. If those are overtime rates, how low the ordinary ones must be!

The tables show that the labour of metalworkers is not much better paid than that of textile workers; the average per-hour overtime earnings fluctuate from 13 to 20 kopeks. In general, the level and change of rates for the overtime work of Moscow metalworkers clearly show that the working conditions there are highly unfavourable even in comparison with, say, St. Petersburg.

For all their overtime, Moscow workers are paid next to nothing.

Thus, average monthly earnings for overtime were:

		(kopeks)
Textile workers		
Sundays and holidays . .	compulsory	408
	optional	221
Weekdays	compulsory	353
	optional	235
Metalworkers		
Sundays and holidays . .	compulsory	337
	optional	184
Weekdays	compulsory	325
	optional	231

Let us emphasise in conclusion that Mr. Kozminykh-Lanin's inquiry dealt little, if at all, with the main sphere of overtime—small-scale industry (only 1.45 per cent of the workers covered by the inquiry were engaged in undertakings employing less than 100 persons). Yet, we feel

sure that the examination of working conditions in small-scale industry would have produced some astounding results.

Prosveshcheniye No. 5, May 1914
Signed: *I. V.*

Printed from the *Prosveshcheniye* text

DECISION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE

The C.C. expresses its gratitude to the C.C. delegation at the Brussels conference[390] for its skilful and vigorous pursuit of the Party's line. The C.C. requests the collegium of delegates to elect one representative to report at a congress or a conference of the R.S.D.L.P. in August 1914.

Written on July 5 or 6 (18 or 19), 1914

First published in 1958 in the magazine *Istorichesky Arkhiv* No. 6

Printed from the original

POLISH OPPOSITION AT THE BRUSSELS CONFERENCE[391]

At the Brussels conference the Polish opposition headed by Malecki went over to the liquidators. With these men deeds do not match words. Let us wait for the results of their July 3 bloc with Alexinsky, Plekhanov and the liquidators. Practice is the best test.

Written after July 5 (18), 1914

First published in 1961 in Vol. 25 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

PLANS FOR AN ARTICLE "REVOLUTION AND WAR"[392]

Revolution and War

1

I. α) July days in 1914 vs. January 1905
   1. gonfalons—barricades
   2. Gapon—illegal Social-Democratic organisation
   3. current slogan—three pillars
   4. naive attitude—persistent struggle
   5. organised finale
   with definite slogan. { *Kievskaya Mysl*[393] / *Russkoye Slovo.* }

II. Strike and armed uprising slogan
(the fool L. V. in Plekhanov's newspaper).

III. War of Austria and Serbia vs.
European war.

IV. Militarism, imperialism.
Guns go off themselves.
Struggle against war
resolution of Jaurès vs. Guesde
experience of workers in Russia.
Best war against war: revolution.

2

1. July days vs. January 9.
2. Political crisis { October / April 22 / Rasputin / famine.
3. Growth of movement and spread of slogans.
4. Discarded liquidationism and little groups abroad.
5. War of Austria and Serbia.

6. Imperialism and militarism.
7. War against war.
8. World situation and tasks of proletariat in Russia.

Written between July 15 and 18 (28 and 31), 1914

First published in 1961 in Vol. 25 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

1914 – 1917

ON THE SLOGAN TO TRANSFORM THE IMPERIALIST WAR INTO A CIVIL WAR[394]

The only correct proletarian slogan is to transform the present imperialist war into a civil war. This transformation flows from all the objective conditions of the current military disaster, and only by systematically propagandising and agitating in *t h a t* direction can the workers' parties fulfil the obligations they undertook at Basle.[395]

That is the only kind of tactics that will be truly revolutionary working-class tactics, corresponding to the conditions of the new historical epoch.

Written not earlier than September 1914

First published in 1961 in Vol. 26 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

PLAN FOR A PAMPHLET *THE EUROPEAN WAR AND EUROPEAN SOCIALISM*[396]

The European War and European Socialism

1. Character of war: imperialism (as the main thing). Imperialism as the *final* stage in the development of capitalism.
2. National wars at the start of the bourgeois epoch vs. ⟶ *National* war: to consolidate the national territory as a base for the development of capitalism, to sweep away the pre-capitalist remnants.

imperialist wars at the end of it. (*Imperialist* war: everyone already finds the sinking capitalist ship overcrowded, and tries to push the others aside and delay the end of capitalism.

3. Long-standing (30-40 years) diplomatic preparation of the war: its "natural" and "expected" character (and "weaned their thoughts from": Adler at the last sitting of the International Bureau[397]).
4. National war (Serbia) as a by-product of present-day war.
5. Bourgeoisie's use of national war tradition: "*La patrie*",* *Luzzatti*.
6. "Country." Quotation from the *Communist Manifesto*. Its analysis.
7. (α) The working men have no country.
   (β) *I n i t i a l l y* within the framework of the nation ⟶ cf. the wars of 1790-1814, 1859, 1866, 1870.

   India's present war or one between China and Japan ((eventuell**))

   (γ) and even then *not* in the bourgeois sense.
   (δ) Emancipation is impossible without the joint efforts of the proletarians.
   (ε) Collapse of national partitions.
8. Attitude to this truth: opportunists' defence of nationalism (Jaurès in *L'Armée nouvelle*)....[398]

   (H. Wendel in *Neue Zeit*, 1914, **N 19**, S. *8 4 3*; *for* Jaurès).[399]
9. Vacillation in the International: defensive and offensive war or "standpoint of proletarian interest"?

---

* "Fatherland."—*Ed.*
** Hypothetically.—*Ed.*

10. Quotations from old statements by Bebel and others, and silence about the 1912 resolution.
11. Basle Manifesto (α) quotations from Stuttgart
(β) threat of civil war (1871 and 1905)
(γ) "crime".
12. "Calamities of invasion" = sophism (Kautsky)....
"Tolstoyism" = idem.
"Practical question: victory or defeat for *one's own* country" = sophism.[400]
All this boils down to the question of two camps.
Yes, but which two camps? Nations or classes?
What do the workers lose with their country? The "eternal" in country.
Country as a bourgeois state and its boundaries—country as language, territory, etc.
13. Practical attitude of socialists towards the present war:
Before the war: H. Wendel in *Neue Zeit*, 1914, **N 18.**[401]
id. *Vorwärts*
Leipziger Volkszeitung on war with "tsarism"
id. *Vorwärts*.[402]
14. After the war: Serb socialists [invasion? / conquest?] p. 10 of extracts
15. Russian Social-Democrats (walk-out from hall is not influence, cf. Fischer[403]).

To 15.
Russians in Paris "volunteering"??
(1) Declaration by Russian socialists.
(2) Declaration by Leder & Co.[404]
Golos No. 9.[405]
Plekhanov's stand
||| "*Sovremennoye Slovo*" *extracts*.[406]
||| "*Golos*" *No. 3* (September 15).[407]
Smirnov (Y.) and P. Maslov.[408]

16. French and Belgian socialists.
Being strangulated? So ... be a bourgeois minister??
Vandervelde. Guesde. (Authorities?)
Voting credits?

What is to be done? Preach and prepare civil war. Instead of becoming ministers, join the illegal propagandists!!

The *chauvinism* of Vaillant & Co. in *L'Humanité*.[409]

Compère-Morel about 1792[410] and...

... the Russians in Poland.

The despicable G. Hervé and the anarcho-syndicalists.[411]

"Democracy"—and what about the alliance with the tsar??

17. British socialists

Hyndman and the pre-war attitude to him on the part of the German Social-Democratic press.[412]

Keir Hardie and MacDonald.

Struggle against chauvinism *at home*. Prussian militarism, but what about Egypt? and women in irons? Participation in recruitment.

18. German Social-Democrats. The main force. Hegemony in the International. "Of whom much will be asked"....

Haase's speech.... Justification of war.[413]

Voting credits = betrayal!

"Tsarism." Sophism and falsehood!!

Bourgeois lies!!

Bernstein in *Vorwärts* about Engels (1859)....[414]

Engels 1890[415] (contra *Mehring*)[416]

Hamburger Echo vs. *Vorwärts*.[417]

19. Bestial chauvinism vs. boring and hypocritical chauvinism.

20. R. Fischer and reply to him.[418]

(Defence of violation of Belgium's neutrality.)

Sozialistische Monatshefte: moral justification of violation of Belgium's neutrality.[419]

21. Two trends in German socialism.

Karl Liebknecht (*Golos* No. 12[420] and the British newspapers).

Bremer Bürger-Zeitung[421]—Mehring—Halle[422]
(timid protests)....

22. Collapse of the International { *Bremer Bürger-Zeitung*[423] / Mehring / Swiss newspapers } *On the collapse of the International*
Volksrecht[424]

Polemics between the French and the Germans
Manifesto of the French and the Belgians
(International Bureau?).[425]
"Government's standpoint among the French"
(and among the Germans??)

"An International restored and freed from turncoats."

"An International freed from turncoats" (*Golos* No. 12).[426]

23. Putting the collapse of the International in a *better light*.
Vandervelde and Kautsky
"Cuckoo and cock."[427]
"Both right"
"kleinmütige Freunde"??*

NB
Südekum's trip.[428]
The interests of the French and the German bourgeoisie.

24. Causes of the collapse of the International: opportunism.
Stuttgart 1907.
Left-wing conference in Copenhagen in 1910.[429]

25. Opportunists' ideas and current behaviour { from Danish resolution on opportunism.[430] }

26. The whole International?
Not!! The Serbs
Keir Hardie
Reply to Fischer.

* "Faint-hearted friends."—*Ed.*

Elements of the Third International.
Authorities: Kautsky, *Guesde*, Vandervelde??
(attitude to authorities)....

27. Opportunism vs. Centre in the International.
Sozialistische Monatshefte.
Majority of Social-Democratic papers.
Methods used by *Vorwärts*
Kautsky.
{Hypocrisy or embellishment.}

28. Peace against war or civil war against national war? (A peace of opportunists united with the bourgeoisie.)

"Kindly peace"—slogan of petty-bourgeois radicals, petty bourgeoisie (cf. Trevelyan & Co. in Britain[431]).
cf. *Frankfurter Zeitung*, extracts.[432]

29. Transforming national war into civil war
1871
1905

Historical character of this transformation.

"*Weg zur Macht*"* and "*striving for overthrow*."

The rapidity of this transformation is one thing, the direction towards it, another.

30. Legality and illegality of organisation.

Riga and St. Petersburg Committee in Russia (comment in *Russkoye Znamya*)[433]

Contra K. Kautsky & Co. on "patriotism" of workers in Russia.

Comparison with army

Golos No. 18, column 1 and No. 18, column 4.[434]

30 bis. *Vorwärts* and the *class struggle.*

("W. C. Modell 70")[435]

one should not renounce legal organisation, but should not confine oneself to it

* Way to power."—*Ed.*

31. *Volkskrieg*.* Yes!
But the conclusions
from this are different.

militia not at all
merely for defence.
Glory to war and
42-centimetre!![436]

32. Frank and "Opfertod"**
..."from the Social-Democratic standpoint"....

32 bis. The war has revealed every weakness both of the governments and of the socialist parties.

33. The calamities of war and its consequences. Revolutionary movement—and collapse of the miserable diplomacy of the Centre.

33 bis. The reactionary aims of the war *Kreuz-Zeitung*[437] and *Novoye Vremya*.
MacDonald's "pessimism"?[438]
Growth of nationalism.
Last war?

Y. Smirnov in *Russkiye Vedomosti* No. 202.
Nationalism in *Russia*.
P.S.D. and S.R.s
"Volunteering": see §15.

34. Direction of work: voting credits= bugler at the front.

(1) No voting of credits. That is betrayal.
(2) Against the chauvinists *at home*.
(3) No stopping at legal organisation.
(4) No forgetting of the Basle Manifesto on the threat of civil war.

35. Perhaps, there is another half a century of oppression before the socialist revolution, but what will *our* epoch leave, what will

* People's War.—*Ed*.
** Sacrificing one's life."—*Ed*.

be our own contribution? Scorn for the opportunists and traitors or *preparation* of civil war??
Martov in *Golos* No. 21
too early for Commune slogan: isolation from the broad popular masses!!?[439]

Written in September-October 1914

First published in 1930 in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*

Printed from the original

TO THE AUTHOR OF *THE SONG OF THE FALCON*

Every class-conscious worker will feel a pang when he sees Gorky's signature alongside that of P. Struve under the chauvinistic-clerical protest against German barbarity.[440]

In a talk we once had about Chaliapin's genuflections, Gorky said: "You can't judge him too strictly; we artists have a different mentality." In other words, the artist frequently acts under the influence of his emotion, which attains such a force that it suppresses all other considerations.

Let that be so. Let us say that Chaliapin must not be strictly judged. He is an artist, and nothing more. He is a stranger to the cause of the proletariat: today, he is a friend of the workers, tomorrow, a reactionary, moved by his emotion.

But the workers have grown accustomed to regard Gorky as their own. They have always believed that his heart beats as warmly as theirs for the cause of the proletariat, and that he has dedicated his talent to the service of this cause.

That is why they keep sending messages of greetings to Gorky, and that is why his name is so dear to them. It is this trust on the part of the class-conscious workers that imposes on Gorky a certain *duty*—to cherish his good name and to refrain from putting his signature to all sorts of cheap chauvinist protests which could well confuse the workers who lack political consciousness. They are still unable to find their bearings in many situations, and could be led astray by Gorky's name. Struve's name will not confuse any worker, but Gorky's may.

Therefore, the class-conscious workers, who well realise the falsehood and the vulgarity of this hypocritical protest against the "German barbarians", must feel that they have to rebuke the author of *The Song of the Falcon*. They will-tell him: "At this hard and responsible moment through which the proletariat of Russia is going, we expected you to go hand in hand with its leading fighters and not with Mr. Struve & Co.!"

Sotsial-Demokrat No. 34,
December 5, 1914

Printed from the
Sotsial-Demokrat

EDITORIAL NOTE TO THE ARTICLE "THE UKRAINE AND THE WAR"

From the Editors

The above article has been written by a prominent supporter of the *Dzvin* trend.[441] Just recently, we have had to engage in some sharp polemics with that trend. We still have some differences with its writers. We do not regard as correct the concessions they have made to nationalism; we believe the idea of "cultural-national autonomy" to be bourgeois nationalism; we do not think that the best way to organise the proletariat is to break it up into national curias, and we do not share their views of the distinctions between "anational", national and international. Being advocates of consistent *internationalism*, we entertain the hope that the author of this article and his friends will learn the necessary lessons from the events of the European war.

At any rate, we are happy to note that precisely at this hard moment the said group of Ukrainian leaders are most aware of their propinquity with *Sotsial-Demokrat*. It is to their credit that they have succeeded in separating themselves from the notorious "Alliance for the Liberation of the Ukraine",[442] whose activity has nothing in common with Social-Democracy.

Sotsial-Demokrat No. 38,
February 12, 1915

Printed from the
Sotsial-Demokrat
text

DRAFT POINT THREE OF THE RESOLUTION "THE C.O. AND THE NEW PAPER", ADOPTED BY THE CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. SECTIONS ABROAD[443]

3. Expressing full sympathy with the idea of further increasing the frequency of the C.O.'s publication, and establishing a popular daily under the C.O. Editorial Board, the conference considers it possible to start the new publication after the main task—the correct organisation of the C.O.—has been secured.

The conference urges all comrades abroad to start working vigorously at once in that direction, calling especially for more systematic support of the C.O. with literary material in connection with the organisation of contributors' conferences, etc.

Written between February 14 and 19 (February 27 and March 4), 1915

Published in 1915 in a hectographed leaflet, "Konferentsia zagranichnykh organizaysii R.S.D.R.P." (Conference of R.S.D.L.P. Organisations Abroad)

Printed from the original

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST WOMEN'S CONFERENCE[444]

Resolution Motioned by the C.C. Delegation

The current world war, which is the cause of so much distress wherever it has broken out, which has devastated and ruined Belgium and Galicia, and which has ruined the lives of thousands upon thousands of workers—this war is an imperialist one, caused by the struggle between the ruling classes of various countries for a division of the colonies and domination of the world market, and by dynastic interests. It is a natural continuation of the policy conducted by the class of capitalists and the governments of all count-

ries; and that is why the question of who struck out first is altogether irrelevant from the socialist standpoint.

This war, far from serving any interests of the workers, is in fact a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes for disrupting the international solidarity of the workers and weakening their movement and class struggle in each country. Similarly, the "defend your country" watchword, put forward by the bourgeoisie and supported by the opportunists, is nothing but a bait to which the bourgeoisie hopes the proletariat will rise and be induced to give their life and blood for its interests.

In view of all this, the Extraordinary International Socialist Women's Conference, on the strength of the Stuttgart resolution, which recommends the use of the economic and political crisis, brought about by the war, for rousing the people to accelerate the collapse of the capitalist system, on the strength of the Copenhagen resolution, which says that it is the duty of deputies to vote against war credits, and of the Basle resolution, which says that the workers consider it a crime to shoot down each other—declares that the representatives of most of the socialist parties of the belligerent countries acted in complete discord with these resolutions and, succumbing to the pressure of circumstances, committed a real betrayal in respect of socialism, supplanting it with nationalism; it insists that the proletarians of all countries have no enemy other than their class enemy—the class of capitalists.

The horrible suffering caused by this war awakens in all women, especially proletarian women, a growing desire for peace. Declaring *war on all imperialist* war, the conference at the same time believes that if this desire for peace is to be transformed into a *conscious political force*, *working women must well realise that the propertied classes are striving for nothing* but annexations, conquest and domination, that in the epoch of imperialism wars are inevitable, and that imperialism threatens the world with a series of wars, unless the *proletariat musters enough strength to put an end to the capitalist system by the final overthrow of capitalism*. Every working woman who wants to shorten the period of suffering connected with the epoch of imperialist wars, must strive to have her urge for peace develop into *indig-*

nation and struggle for socialism. The working woman will attain her aim in this struggle *only through a revolutionary mass movement, and a strengthening and sharpening of the socialist struggle.* Consequently, her first duty is to support the trade union and socialist organisations and break the civil peace by fighting against the war credits, against entry into bourgeois ministries, by supporting and spreading the idea of soldiers' fraternisation in the trenches on the field of battle, by setting up illegal organisations wherever the government has abolished the constitutional freedoms, and finally, by drawing the mass into manifestations and revolutionary movements.

The International Socialist Women's Conference calls on the working women of all countries to start this struggle right away, organising it on an international scale, and closely tying in their work with that of the socialists of all countries who, like Liebknecht, are fighting against nationalism and waging a revolutionary socialist struggle.

At the same time, the conference gives working women a reminder that in the most advanced countries of Europe the objective conditions for socialist production are already there, that the whole movement is entering a new phase, that the current world war imposes fresh and serious duties upon them, and that their movement may be the forerunner of a general mass action which could give fresh scope to the whole socialist movement and advance the hour of final emancipation. By taking the initiative in staging demonstrations and revolutionary manifestations, working women, marching hand in hand with the proletarians, could usher in a new era of proletarian struggle in the course of which the proletariat will win socialism in the more advanced countries, and a democratic republic in the more backward ones.

Supplement to *Sotsial-Democrat*
No. 42, June 1, 1915

Printed from the
text of the
Supplement

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE AT ZIMMERWALD[445]

AUGUST 23-26 (SEPTEMBER 5-8), 1915

1

VARIANT OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION OF LEFT-WING SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS FOR THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE

Draft

The present war springs from imperialism, i.e., the highest stage of capitalism, when the development of the productive forces and the growth of capital have gone beyond the narrow framework of separate national states, and induce the "great" powers to try to enslave other nations and seize colonies as sources of raw materials and areas for the export of capital.

The objective conditions are quite ripe for socialism and the great powers are fighting the current war in an effort artificially to delay the collapse of capitalism, by preserving and intensifying the dependence of colonies, by seizing privileges on the world market, and by splitting and suppressing the international revolutionary struggle of the workers.

Social-Democrats fully recognise the necessity of freedom for all nations. In the epoch of struggle against feudalism, absolutism and foreign national oppression, they recognised defence of one's country—today they recognise as just the war waged by the oppressed nations (especially colonies) against their oppressors, the "great" powers.

But the current war between the great powers is a war between slave-owners to intensify and consolidate slavery, for a redivision of the colonies, for the "right" to oppress other nations, for the privileges of great-power capital and for the reactionary suppression of the working-class movement. That is why talk about "defence of one's country" on the part of both belligerent groups of powers is a bourgeois swindle of the people. Neither the victory by any of the present governments, nor the status quo ante bellum

can safeguard the freedom of nations from the imperialist great powers, nor can it give the possibility of a decent life to the working class, which is being increasingly weighed down by the high cost of living, the trusts, militarism and its attendant political reaction, even in the freest countries.

The real meaning of the "defend your country" slogan in this war is defence of the great-power privileges and advantages, defence of the "right" of the given bourgeoisie to oppress other nations, it is a national-liberal labour policy, an alliance between a small section of the workers and their "own" national bourgeoisie against the mass of proletarians and the exploited. Socialists conducting such a policy are in fact chauvinists—social-chauvinists. The policy of voting for war credits, entering ministries, Burgfrieden,* etc., is a policy of opportunism and betrayal of socialism. The working class cannot attain its great aim of labour emancipation, without carrying on a resolute struggle against opportunism and social-chauvinism.

The Basle Manifesto of 1912, adopted unanimously in anticipation of precisely the kind of war between the great powers which has in fact come about, definitely recognised the reactionary and imperialist character of the war, and clearly announced the approach of a *proletarian revolution* in connection with such a war. In effect, the war has created a revolutionary situation, and has generated revolutionary sentiments and discontent. It is the task of Social-Democrats to maintain and develop these, help to clear the revolutionary awareness of the masses and purge their minds of the falsehood of bourgeois and socialist chauvinism, promote every effort at revolutionary mass struggle against imperialism, for socialism, and to work to transform the imperialist war into a civil war for socialism.

To intensify their revolutionary agitation, Social-Democrats must make use of the growing massive desire for peace, which expresses the disappointment of the masses and the clearing of their revolutionary consciousness. But in so doing, Social-Democrats should not deceive the people by holding out hopes for any kind of stable democratic

* Peace at home.—*Ed.*

peace, that would rule out the oppression of nations, and that would come soon and without the revolutionary overthrow of the present governments.

Written before July 13 (26), 1915
First published in 1937 in *Lenin Miscellany XXX*
Printed from the original

2

THESES FOR A REPORT AT A MEETING OF LEFT-WING SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS[446]

Theses:

1. Fact of the war and the consequences. Overall picture.
2. Imperialist character
   1) colonial plunder
   2) oppression of nations
   3) division of the world.
3. Bringing out the aim.
4. Falsification of its character
   a) emancipation of peoples—oppression
   b) democracy —despotism (reaction?)
   c) culture —barbarous war
   d) welfare —social reforms
   e) capitalist income —high cost of living!
5. Capitalism (Trotsky).
   (Break-up of the bourgeois world)....
6. At the height of the crisis of capitalism; *which* (crisis) dooms the proletariat to the greatest sacrifices it is urged to defend capitalism, there are demands for civil peace.
7. Struggle against war....
8. Decisions of congresses....
9. Official parties—against these decisions
   { voting credits / entry into ministries / for bloc } *Defence of one's country.*
10. Struggle of minorities (and parties) against the war.
11. Return of the working class to its task.
12. I.S.B.
13. Meeting at Berne.[447] (**Links** created.)

14. Banner of class struggle.
15. a) action by belligerent countries....
    b) action by neutral countries....
16. International scale.
17. Terms of peace.
18. Appeal.

Written between August 19 and 23 (September 1 and 5), 1915

First published in 1962 in Vol. 27 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original
Translated from the French and the German

3

PLAN FOR A SPEECH AT THE ZIMMERWALD CONFERENCE

1) *Imperialism* and plunder
2) Diverting the attention of the revolutionary proletariat and weakening its movement...
3) Exposure of bourgeois sophisms —one group
   —another
4) Devoir socialiste...*

5)	Quote	bottom 5. page 5 top— 7. page 5 top [1]
6)	German Social-Democrats cannot plead struggle against tsarism	
7)	Our press has been rebuking us over the German leaders' behaviour	
8)	Quote, p. 8, end from the word Même	[½ page]
9)	Russian S.D. remplit son devoir** by its vote and *illegal proclamation*	
10)	It is harmful to cover up the bankruptcy of the Second Interna-	

* Socialist duty.—*Ed.*
** Has done its duty.—*Ed.*

tional; the Centre is especially harmful
11) This bankruptcy is the bankruptcy of opportunism page 11 [1]
12) Chauvinism in Russia, including a section of the Social-Democrats
13) Defeat of tsarism—the lesser evil
14) Illegal organisation and agitation

quote (end of 15 and 16) [1]

Written between August 23 and 26 (September 5 and 8), 1915

First published in 1962 in Vol. 27 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

4

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE MANIFESTO AND THE DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE WAR AND THE TASKS OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

AUGUST 25 (SEPTEMBER 7)

1

It was inevitable that things here should have come to a struggle of opinion between Ledebour and us.[448] However, I must protest against the method used here by Ledebour in attacking Radek. The assertion that our manifesto has been signed only by men who are safe is inadmissible. It has also been signed by the Latvian delegates and Borchardt. Another old and hackneyed argument is saying that one should not call the masses to revolutionary action unless one is able to take a direct part in it oneself. Furthermore, I deny that there should be no mention of the means of struggle. That has occurred in all revolutionary periods The means should be made known to the masses so that they could be explained and discussed. We in Russia have always acted in this way; in fact, the interpretation of the means of struggle had been the subject of arguments between Plekhanov and myself even in the pro-revolutionary years. When the objective historical situation of 1847 confronted

Germany with revolution, Marx and Engels sent out an appeal from London calling for violence.[449] The German movement is faced with a decision. If we are indeed on the threshold of a revolutionary epoch in which the masses will go over to revolutionary struggle, we must also make mention of the means necessary for this struggle. According to the revisionist view taken by David and others, that is naturally something quite useless: after all, they do not believe that we are on the eve of a revolutionary epoch. We who believe this must act otherwise. You cannot make revolution without explaining revolutionary tactics. It was precisely the worst feature of the Second International that it constantly avoided explanations; and it is that which the Dutch *Tribune*-Marxists[450] quite correctly called the German Centre is "passive revolutionary attitude".

Now on the question of persecutions. You in Germany should in general do more than legal work, if you want real action. You must combine legal and illegal activity. The old methods are no longer adequate to the new situation. You yourselves have said: we are going forward to an epoch of great class battles. In that case, you must also have the means for this. And it is not at all necessary for the manifesto to be signed, it could well be issued without signatures. At any rate, you should not act semi-legally, like Clara Zetkin, for instance. That calls for too much sacrifice.

Here is how things stand: either a truly revolutionary struggle or mere empty talk which will help no one but the deserters, against whom Liebknecht speaks out so sharply in this letter.[451] Coming out for peace does not mean much in itself. David also writes: we are not for the war, but only against defeat. Everyone wants peace. Taking account of the new situation, we should use new and specific means of struggle which should not be similar in any way to the old German or Russian methods.

2

I do not agree with Serrati that the resolution will appear either too early or too late.[452] After this war, other, mainly colonial, wars will be waged. Unless the proletariat turns off the social-imperialist way, proletarian solidarity will

be completely destroyed; that is why we must determine common tactics. If we adopt only a manifesto, Vandervelde, *L'Humanité* and others will once again start deceiving the masses; they will keep saying that they, too, oppose war and want peace. The old vagueness will remain.

First published in 1965
in Vol. 54 of the Fifth Russian
edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from
the minutes of the
conference
Translated from the
French and the German

5

ADDENDA TO THE STATEMENT BY THE ZIMMERWALD LEFT[453]

No. 1. noch die wichtigste Frage des Opportunismus berührt, noch die besonders schädliche Rolle des s.-d. Zentrums aufdeckt.*

No. 2. We vote for, in particular, because two French comrades have put forward an important consideration. It is they who have pointed to the exceptionally oppressed condition of the workers in France, their extreme corruption by revolutionary phrase-mongering, and the need for a slow and cautious transition to resolute tactics. But in Europe as a whole it is opportunism that is the enemy of the working-class movement.

Written on August 26
(September 8), 1915

First published in 1930 in
Lenin Miscellany XIV

Printed from
the original

GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION[454]

German Social-Democracy was the strongest and most influential party of the Second International. That is why, on the one hand, it bears the greatest responsibility for its

* Neither touches on the highly important question of opportunism, nor exposes the exceptionally harmful role of the S.D. Centre.—*Ed.*

collapse, and on the other, its example and experience are *most important* for studying the reasons of this collapse and for analysing the measures, ways and means for fighting the opportunism which has strangulated that party.

The opportunism which has strangulated the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and has transformed that party into a national-liberal labour party, has crystallised as social-chauvinism in the 1914-15 war.

Written in 1915
First published in 1937 in *Lenin Miscellany XXX*
Printed from the original

AMENDMENTS AND ADDENDA TO THE APPEAL "TO ALL AFFILIATED PARTIES AND GROUPS", ADOPTED BY A CONFERENCE OF THE ENLARGED INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST COMMISSION

*Änderungsvorschläge**:

1. Give a more precise and definite statement of the *political-class significance* and the *basic* incorrectness of the tactics of the "official parties" and "the Second International" . . .
   - (a) defence of country = defence of imperialist bourgeoisie, its plunder and oppression of nations
   - (b) connection with opportunism
   - (c) alliance with the bourgeoisie at home against the international proletariat.
2. Definition of "Bruch des Burgfriedens".**
   Non-participation in any institution directly or indirectly supporting the war.

αβ + Unterjochung der Nationen.***
Delete the end about "In der Aera"....****

+ Greetings to Liebknecht and Rühle.

* Proposals on amendments.—*Ed.*
** "Breakdown of civil peace."—*Ed.*
*** Subjugation of nations.—*Ed.*
**** "In the course of the era"....—*Ed.*

3. Nicht nur "geeignete", sondern illegale Literatur, das heisst *freie*, nicht der Zensur unterordnete*.

γ	ohne zu sagen, dass die Niederwerfung dieser Regierung dazu nötig**

+

4. Strikes (economic and political) and demonstrations.
5. + bis zur Revolution.***
6. + Quotes not only from the Stuttgart resolution, but also from the Basle resolution: it is a crime to shoot the Commune, 1905.

Written between January 23 and 27 (February 5 and 9), 1916

First published in 1962 in Vol. 27 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

* Not only "adapted", but also illegal literature, i.e., *free* literature, not subjected to censorship.—*Ed.*

** Without saying that it calls for the overthrow of this government.—*Ed.*

*** All the way to the revolution.—*Ed.*

PLAN FOR A LECTURE ON

2 Internationals

rpt.

1. Subject: not an assessment of the war (>1 year ago and outdated), but (two) *basic lines* in the development of the working-class movement and socialism.

   Alias: not an *assessment* of the war or tactical *principles*, but an assessment of the course the working-class movement has taken.
   Accordingly, the main thing: facts (on a broad scale) of the working-class movement and socialism, and *comparison* of various countries.

2. *Introduction*. Huysmans in Arnhem and in Rotterdam vs. Wijnkoop et *Henriette Roland-Holst* in *Berner Tagwacht*.[456]

   ?+cf. *Avanti!* (February 12, 1916)?[457]

   *Vorwärts**

2**a**. *Etwa*:

1. Russia: Patriots (Plekhanov & Co.)	—O.C. and Trotsky (*Nashe Slovo*)	—
2. Germany: Majority	—K. Kautsky & Co.	—
3. France: Majority	—Longuet & Co.	—
4. Britain: Majority	(Fabian Society, Labour Party,[459]	

* The word *Vorwärts* appears to have been pencilled in later.—*Ed*.

"TWO INTERNATIONALS"[455]

Subject:

You might say the world working-class and socialist movement as the touchstone of theory.

NB:
In the *O. C.*: (1) blaming the workers; (2) forgetting the ties with the liquidators.

—C. C.

—minority. I. S. D.* —(*Rühle*)—*Winnig*

—Bourderon & Co. || Bourderon's resolution || *Reports in "Labour Leader"*[458]
Hyndman)—Askew (?)—*Forward*.[460]

Glasgow | NB: "Merthyr"[461] NB
Socialist[462]

{Ornatsky in *Nashe Slovo*[463]} (break with the Labour Party) | *Letters* in *Labour Leader*

— — — — — —

* Internationale Sozialisten Deutschlands.—*Ed.*

5. Italy: Minority (Bissolati)—
6. *Austria*: Majority (Pernerstorfer)

7. America: Russel —(Hillquit)
8. Australia. Majority (government party)

3. *Russia*. Elections to *War Industries* Committees. *First* elections to C. C. (+the vacillating) + *defencist bloc* (Larin). Indignation of the bourgeoisie and the government. Gvozdev's denunciation. *Second* elections. Victory of chauvinists.

Nashe Dyelo[466] + *Nash Golos*[467] + *Rabocheye Utro*[468]
O. C.

Trotsky and *Nashe Slovo* (Chkheidze group?)
C. C.

Martov's evolution: from "*Vorwärts* is dead" and "we will not go into the International"—*to* defence of alliance with *Nashe Dyelo* (Boretsky).

This may well be brilliant "diplomacy", but there is ***not a bit*** of *socialism* in it.

Result: two lines in the working-class movement in Russia.
Only two (the rest has passed away).

Their *class basis*:
(α) in alliance with domestic bourgeoisie =
(β) in alliance with international proletariat =
Their *ideas*: for "defence" ("defence of country");
("defencists");
against "defence of country"...
(cf. Zimmerwald Manifesto)*

4. *Germany*.
Struggle within group: Liebknecht und *Rühle* 2 and *20* (their inconsistency).[471]

* Points 2 and 3 are crossed out in pencil in the MS.—*Ed.*

Italian official party. (*Avanti!* Feb. 12, 1916)
— Adler — minority. (report in *Berner Tagwacht*[464])
— — — Debs (*Debs's* articles[465]) ("bombs and dollars")
— ? — — socialists.

"... Not for defence, but for organisation ...."

Social-chauvinist mockery of Martov (Boretsky in *Nashe Slovo*).

NB: Stolypin
"*Khvostov labour party*,[469]

= for strengthening "domestic" bourgeoisie (= *for* war)
= for international proletarian revolution.

+ "Europa und die Revolution" in here?[470]

{*Fall Liebknecht** pamphlet
"regeneration"
"national-liberal party".}

* The Liebknecht Case.—*Ed.*

Borchardt and *Lichtstrahlen*[472]
Winnig.
Rühle and reply of *Vorwärts* (Analysis).[473]
{ (α) Circulation of illegal literature and illegal organisation.
(β) Helping the government. }

5. *France*.
(1) Vaillant in *L'Humanité* (letters?)[475]
("stopped their ears with blood-soaked cotton wool", "doctrinaires", etc., etc.)
{{ (2) Merrheim's words at Zimmerwald: "le parti, le gouvernement et les Jouhaux ne sont que trois têtes sous un bonnet".* }}
(3) Bourderon's resolution ((analysis of its text)).
(4) Report in *Labour Leader* **on the split.**

6. *Britain*.
Majority (participation in ministry)
defence.
The New Statesman[477] (and its attitude)
(Labour Party+Fabian Society).
contra—*B. S. P.*, where 3/7 are internationalists
Glasgow Socialist ((statement at Zimmerwald[478]))
Letters in *Labour Leader*.
Article on *betrayal*.
Merthyr.

7. *Italy*.
Bissolati—party
(Treves and his speech[480])
{ *Italy*: Bissolati and the labour party
Bulgaria: Tesnyaki[481] and Shiroki
Sweden: Branting and Höglund
Holland: Troelstra and *Tribune*.[482] }**

---

* "The party, the government and the Jouhaux are nothing but three heads under one cap."—*Ed*.

** Point 7 is crossed out in pencil in the MS.—*Ed*.

Demonstration in Brunswick.[474]
(Strike in Hannover.)

Saumoneau's leaflet.[476]

(Brizon & Co. at Kienthal).*

Lloyd George in *Glasgow* and workers' reply.

British Socialist Party
(Hyndman's walk-out[479])**.

* The text from the word "regeneration" to the words "(Brizon & Co. at Kienthal)" is in pencil and appears to have been written later.—*Ed.*

** The text was apparently pencilled in later.—*Ed.*

8. *Austria.*
Pernerstorfer in *Neue Zeit*[483]
—V. Adler—***internationalists***...
{idem: resolution of V. Adler and "15".*

9. *United States of North America.*
("Wait and see"....)
Russel (V. Berger & Co.) for "preparedness". "Jingo"
Hillquit = diplomat**
Debs and his articles.

10. *Australia.*
Report in ***Berner Tagwacht***.[484]
Article in *New Statesman*
(I. K.[485])***

11. *Results.*
{{K. Kautsky in a letter to Bukvoyed....{{"There are no two directions"}}
id. in *Neue Zeit* many times.
Falsehood and lies.
K. Kautsky in Breitscheid report ("either the old International or half a dozen").
Two and only two.
Throughout the world.

(Montagne and Gironde (Plekhanov in *Iskra* No. 2, 1901, "On the Threshold of the 20th Century").
("Boys with $2" and with capitalist "brains" in *Appeal to Reason*.[486]
Not diplomatic cover-up ("St. Petersburg slush"—Kautskian Vaut mieux dire****).
but explanation to the masses.
Inevitability of split.

---

* Apparently pencilled in later.—*Ed.*

** The text from the word "Jingo" to the word "diplomat" is crossed out in pencil.—*Ed.*

*** The text from the word "article" to "(I. K.)" was apparently pencilled in later.—*Ed.*

**** Better to say.—*Ed.*

Diplomacy—**hypocrisy**—**vacillation**—**delusion**?

{{ It is not the word that matters.
Axelrod and Martov — in Russia
K. Kautsky and Haase — in Germany
Longuet et — in France
Pressemane
Hillquit in America
Askew and others in Britain
} one type }

ΣΣ = ***Huysmans***.*

* The text from the word "diplomacy" to the word "Huysmans" is crossed out in pencil.—*Ed*.

Revolution (cf. *L'information* +Europa *und die* Revolution)*
Iskra No. 2 (1901): Montagne and Gironde.
Struggle against opportunism { Bernstein. / Millerandism and Jaurèsism. / British liberal labour policy. / Split in a number of countries. }
The war has accelerated
the development — — of the
break-up both ways.
Quid est Kienthal?**

Written between January 30 and February 4 (February 12 and 17), 1916

First published in 1962 in Vol. 27 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

NOTE TO THE THESES "SOCIALIST REVOLUTION AND THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION"

There is some similarity between the way mankind should arrive at the abolition of classes and the way it should subsequently arrive at the fusion of nations. Thus, only a transition stage of dictatorship by the oppressed class leads to the abolition of classes, only the liberation of the oppressed nations and real eradication of national oppression leads to the fusion of nations, and the political criterion of the feasibility of this lies precisely in the freedom to secede. Freedom to secede is the best and the only *political* means against the idiotic system of petty states and national isolation which, to mankind's good fortune, is being inexorably destroyed by the whole course of capitalist development.

Written in January-February 1916

First published in 1937 in *Lenin Miscellany XXX*

Printed from the original
Translated from the German

---

* The text from the word "boys" to the word "revolution" is crossed out in pencil.—*Ed.*

** What is Kienthal? The text from the words "*Iskra* No. 2" to the end appears to have been pencilled in later.—*Ed.*

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE TO TERMINATE PUBLICATION OF THE JOURNAL *KOMMUNIST*[487]

Not for the press:

Taking into consideration

(1) that *Kommunist* was founded—temporarily and as an experiment—by a federated editorial board, when there had been no sign of *any* difference on any substantial question between the C.O. Editorial Board and the rest of the Editorial Board as a whole;

(2) that after No. 1-2 of "*Kommunist*" *three* members of the Editorial Board put forward such differences in their signed theses on the question of self-determination;

(3) that an exchange of opinion on this question revealed deep divergence over the assessment of the role of democratic demands and the minimum programme in general;—

—the C.C. resolves: to recognise the continuation of the journal *Kommunist* as impossible and to declare that *this publication is hereby terminated*.—

Furthermore. With a view to *extending* the discussion on the controversial questions and to having them clarified before a broader circle of leading comrades, the C.C. resolves:

> to request the three comrades who have signed the theses to draw up a *motivated statement* of their differences with the C.O. Editorial Board.

This statement together with a reply by the C.O. Editorial Board shall be communicated to a broader circle of leading Party workers for a *final* decision on whether it is desirable and necessary to open a debate in the press.[488]

I very much regret that *you* are dragging out this "terribly boring" business. *I repeat*—I, too, am terribly bored with having to repeat—that I *must decline* to take part in *Kommunist*.

Your plan lacks principle and tends to *confound* the confusion. *If there are no* profound differences of principle, the submission to the C.C. is either slander or intrigue, and you will be exposed by every worker in Russia.

If there are, *as much* must be said: after No. 1-2 people have begun to confuse things outrageously; *we*

decline responsibility; we believe it to be our duty *not* to encourage but to expose. *As a concession* we invite (see leaflet) them to have another discussion before an "enlarged circle" (so as not to shame them in the press; *not to kill* them outright by polemics).

{That is the only reason.}

For *Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata*[489] we have, apart from a number of our articles,* Varin + Alexander + reports + indictment (I have not yet received it) + Safarov + Latvian + Kollontai (probably).

The Japanese[490] should be invited only to be shamed; Bukharin—only *order material* on the economic question.

Radek should *not* be invited (his article is *legal* and is *not at all important* in this shape). We shall have to *fight* against *his* theses.

Here is my opinion. *Kommunist* is a *corpse* and I am not taking part in reviving it.

Alexander (and the Russian workers in the Bureau) should confront them with this question *of principle*: we *do not take* on the Editorial Board people who confuse things outrageously and refuse to learn, who do not even wish to make an effort to set forth their opinion. They want to *play us off* against the P.S.D., that much is clear, while they themselves are safe on the sidelines.

Kommunist met the task of *that* period: to rally everyone *against* social-chauvinism and Kautskyism.

The task now is **different**: we are faced with a *struggle* against "imperialist *Economism*".

Salut,
Lenin

P.S. Why did you not reply *whether or not Sukhanov was sent to Geneva*? I send you material for Grimm.

No *luck* with translation of the theses.

Written after March 28
(April 10), 1916

First published in 1962
in Vol. 27 of the Fifth Russian
edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from
the original

* There will be enough "writers" for *two* collections!

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE AT KIENTHAL[491]

APRIL 11-17 (24-30), 1916

1

INITIAL VARIANT OF THE R.S.D.L.P. CENTRAL COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

Proposal from the R.S.D.L.P. C.C. to the Second Socialist Conference Called by the I.S.C. (Berne)*[492]

(Theses on Points 5, 6, 7a and 7b and 8 of the Agenda)

In announcing the convocation of the Second International Socialist Conference, the I.S.C. published the following key points of the agenda:

5. "struggle to end the war"
6. "problem of peace"
7a. parliamentary "action" } "agitation and propaganda"
7b. mass " }
8. International Socialist Bureau.

The I.S.C. has invited the organisations to discuss these questions and to send in their proposals. Here is the reply of our Party C.C. to the invitation:

1. Just as all war is but a continuation by violent means of the politics which the belligerent states and their ruling classes had been conducting for many years, sometimes for decades, before the outbreak of the war, so the peace that ends any war can be nothing but a consideration and a record of the actual changes brought about in the relations of forces as a result of the given war.

2. It is therefore the greatest absurdity and stupidity, from the standpoint of theory, and from the standpoint of socialist doctrine, and the greatest fraud on the working class in practice, to engage in talk about assessing the present war on the strength of "simple" concepts of defence and attack and about assessing the future peace on the strength of "simple" pious wishes for a stable, democratic, honourable, etc., peace.

3. This war is an imperialist war, i.e., a war resulting

* See present edition, Vol. 22, pp. 169-79.—*Ed.*

from contradictions on the basis of a highly developed monopoly capitalism which is ripe for transition to socialism. This war is being fought for world hegemony, i.e., for fresh oppression of the weak nations, for another division of the world, for a division of the colonies, spheres of influence, etc.—a division under which the old plundering powers, Britain, France and Russia, would give up a share of their booty to Germany, a young and stronger plundering power.

4. That is why, unless the proletarian revolution overthrows the present governments and the present ruling classes of the belligerent "great" powers, there is *absolutely no chance of any* peace *other* than a more or less short-term armistice between the imperialist powers, a peace accompanied by a *growth* of reaction within the states, a *growth* of national oppression and enslavement of the weak nations, a *growth* of inflammable material preparatory for new wars, etc. For the fact is that from the objective content of the politics which has been bred by the entire epoch of imperialism and which the bourgeoisie of *all* the belligerent "great" powers had conducted before *this* war and is conducting *during it*, inevitably flows a peace resting on a new and even worse oppression of nations, etc.

5. To arouse in the masses of people ideas or hopes of the possibility of a stable or democratic, etc., peace between the present governments and the present ruling classes (i.e., the bourgeoisie allied with the landowners), as most of the official socialist parties are doing, is not only shamelessly to cheat the people but to lull them and distract them from the revolutionary struggle, which is already starting in the form of the strike and demonstration movement.

6. It is precisely this kind of cheating the people and distracting the proletariat from the revolutionary struggle that characterises the "peace programme" which is now being "unanimously" put forward both by the official spokesman of the Second International Huysmans at the Congress of the Sozialdemokratische Arbeiter Partei of Holland at Arnhem, and by Kautsky, the most influential theorist of the Second International and the most influential advocate of the social-patriots and social-chauvinists in all countries. Their programme consists in hypocritical

lip service to some democratic pious wishes: repudiation of annexations and indemnities, self-determination of nations, democratisation of foreign policy, arbitration courts to settle conflicts between states, disarmament, a United States of Europe, etc.

7. The best evidence that this "peace programme" is downright hypocrisy is, on the one hand, the lip service paid to it by a number of bourgeois pacifists and demagogic ministers of the belligerent countries, and, on the other, its duplication by notorious (notorisch) chauvinists at the conferences of "socialists" of one group of belligerent powers in London (February 1915)[493] and of the other in Vienna (April 1915).[494] It is the "socialists" who have entered the bourgeois ministries carrying on the plunderous war, who have voted for the war credits, who have helped the war by participating in various organisations and institutions, etc., it is they who are *actually* conducting the policy of safeguarding the old and new annexations, colonial oppression, etc., that have proclaimed to the world their "peace programme", consisting in a repudiation of annexations, etc.

8. Kautsky, the leading authority of the Second International, declared to the whole world on May 21, 1915 (*Neue Zeit*) that this accord and "unanimity" of "socialists" in London* and in Vienna over the principle of "independence" or self-determination of nations is proof of the "unanimity" and "viability" of the Second International in the "peace programme". This defence and sanction of the most crying and most brazen hypocrisy and deception of the workers is not in any sense a coincidence, but a systematic policy which is being conducted in a number of countries by men who pretend to be internationalists but are actually making the imperialist war more attractive by applying to it the idea of "defence of one's country" and consolidating the domination of the working-class movement by the social-chauvinists, who have betrayed socialism, by preaching "unity" with them. This policy, which is the most harmful and dangerous one for the working class, is being conducted by Kautsky, Haase and others in Germany,

* An inadvertent mistake in the MS., which says "Copenhagen".—*Ed.*

Longuet, Pressemane and others in France, most of the leaders in Britain, Axelrod, Martov, Chkheidze & Co. in Russia, Trèves and others in Italy (see the threat of the Central Organ of the Italian Party, *Avanti!*, on March 5, 1916, to expose Trèves and other reformist-possibilists[495] as to "who resorted to every means to prevent the Party Executive and Oddino Morgari from taking action to secure unity at Zimmerwald and to create a new International"). This world-wide policy, which is of the utmost danger to the working class, could be called a *Kautskian* policy, after its most authoritative spokesman.

9. Socialists cannot refuse to fight for reform. They must vote everywhere, including the parliaments, by the way, for all, even the slightest, improvements in the condition of the masses, such as increased relief for the inhabitants of the devastated areas, lessening of national oppression, etc. But on the basis of the *p r e s e n t* war and the peace flowing *from it*, this kind of reformist activity to improve the condition of the masses is apparently possible only on a miniature scale. It would be a crying deception of the masses to suggest to them, whether directly or indirectly, the idea that the questions raised by the *p r e s e n t* war could have a reformist solution. For *t h i s* war has created a revolutionary situation in Europe, bringing to the fore the *most fundamental* problems of imperialism, which will inevitably have an imperialist solution, except where the present governments and ruling classes of Europe are overthrown through revolution. That is why the principal and fundamental talk of socialists in the struggle for stable and democratic peace must be: first, to explain to the masses the need for *revolutionary mass struggle*, to spread the idea of it systematically, and to set up the necessary organisations; second, to expose the *hypocrisy* and *falsehood* both of the bourgeois pacifist and of the socialist, notably Kautskian, talk about peace and the "unanimity" of the Second International on the "peace programme". Such talk is doubly hypocritical on the part of "socialists" who follow the bourgeoisie in denying the possibility of transforming the present imperialist war into a civil war for socialism, and who oppose any revolutionary work in that direction.

10. The central point of the currently prevalent hypocri-

sy concerning the "peace programme" is the allegedly unanimous recognition of the struggle against *old* and *new annexations*. But those who talk of annexations and the struggle against them either cannot or will not for the most part give thought to *what annexation is*. Clearly, annexation will not be the right word for every appropriation of "foreign" territory, for, generally speaking, socialists favour the abolition of frontiers between nations, their getting closer together and integration, and the formation of larger states. Clearly, not every disturbance of the status quo can be described as annexation, for this would be extremely reactionary and a mockery of the fundamental concepts of the science of history. Clearly, annexation does not apply to every kind of integration by force of arms, for socialists cannot repudiate violence in the interests of the majority of the population and in the interests of human progress. Annexation can and must clearly apply only to the appropriation of a territory *against the will* of the population of that territory. In other words, the concept of annexation is inseparably bound up with the concept of *self-determination of nations*.

11. The *present* war—precisely because it is an imperialist war insofar as *both* groups of belligerent "great" powers are concerned—inevitably had to and did give rise to the phenomenon of the bourgeoisie and the social-chauvinists "*fighting*" violently against "annexations" *whenever* this is done by an *enemy* state. Südekum and his Austro-German friends and defenders, including Haase and Kautsky, are silent about Germany's annexations in respect of Alsace-Lorraine, Denmark, Poland, etc., but very frequently "struggle against the annexations" carried out by Russia in respect of Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, the Caucasus, etc., by Britain in respect of India, etc. On the other band, the British, French, Italian and Russian Südekums, viz., Hyndman, Guesde, Vandervelde, Renaudel, Trèves, Plekhanov, Axelrod, Chkheidze & Co., are silent about Britain's annexations in respect of India, France's in respect of Nice or Morocco, Italy's in respect of Tripoli or Albania, Russia's in respect of Poland, the Ukraine, etc., but then *for the most part* "struggle against the annexations" carried out by Germany.

This kind of "struggle against annexations" on the part of the social-chauvinists and the Kautskians is clearly downright hypocritical, and the bourgeoisie is promoting their struggle both directly, by allocating millions upon millions for chauvinist propaganda, and indirectly, by giving the social-chauvinists and the Kautskians a monopoly on legality.

The French "socialists", who justify war over Alsace-Lorraine, and the German "socialists", who fail to demand freedom for Alsace-Lorraine to secede from Germany, are clearly both annexationists, no matter how much they swear to the contrary. The Russian "socialists", who talk or write against the "disintegration of Russia" or now, directly or indirectly, justify the war over who is to enslave Poland, in the name of the "peace without annexations" slogan, are clearly annexationists as well, etc., etc.

12. If the "struggle against annexations" is not to become an empty phrase or a revolting hypocrisy, socialists must: *first*, explain to the masses that it is necessary to wage revolutionary struggle for the proletariat's winning of political power and for a socialist revolution which stems from all the conditions of the imperialist epoch and the present imperialist war and which alone can fully secure the self-determination of nations everywhere, i.e., liberate the oppressed nations, bring the nations closer together and effect their fusion not on the basis of violence, but on the basis of equality and accord between the proletariat and the working people of all nations; *second*, they must immediately start the most extensive propaganda and agitation against the veiled chauvinism and annexationism of the official socialist parties, especially of those of the "great" powers. Socialists must explain to the masses that a socialist and an internationalist only in name but a chauvinist and an annexationist in fact is the English socialist who fails at once to struggle for freedom to secede for Ireland, India, etc.—the French socialist who fails to struggle for the freedom of the French colonies, against the war to annex Alsace and Lorraine, etc.—the German socialist who fails to struggle for freedom to secede for Alsace-Lorraine, the Danes, the Poles, the Belgians, the Serbs, etc.—the Russian socialist who fails to struggle for freedom

to secede for the Ukraine, Finland, etc., against the war over Poland—the Italian socialist who fails to struggle for freedom to secede for Tripoli, Albania, etc.—the Dutch socialist who fails to struggle for freedom to secede and independence for the Dutch East Indies—the Polish socialist who fails to struggle for the full freedom and equality of the Jews and the Ukrainians oppressed by the Poles, etc.

13. From the Zimmerwald Manifesto and the I.S.C. circular of February 10, 1916 (*Bulletin* No. 3)[496] inevitably flows the proposition that all "war against war" and "struggle for peace" is *hypocrisy* unless it is indissolubly bound up with immediate *revolutionary mass struggle*, and with its propaganda and preparation. But this conclusion must be stated straightforwardly and explicitly. We must, first, explain to the masses where the development of revolutionary mass struggle in the conditions of a European war can and *must* (muß) lead. It leads inevitably to the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war for socialism. A *hint* of this is given in all the speeches saying that the workers should die for their own cause rather than an alien one. But hints are not enough. The great, even if perhaps not very near, goal must be clearly set before the masses. They must know where to go and why. Second, if we call on the masses to fight against their governments, "regardless of the military position of the given country", we thereby not only repudiate the admissibility of "defending the country", as a principle, in the *present* war, but admit the *desirability* of defeat for every *bourgeois* government in order to transform its defeat into revolution. That, too, must be squarely put: revolutionary mass struggle cannot become an international one unless its conscious representatives unite openly for the purpose of defeating and overthrowing *all* bourgeois governments. Third—and this is the most important thing—it is *impossible* to conduct any revolutionary mass struggle without setting up everywhere, not only at the top, but also among the masses, an illegal organisation for its propaganda and preparation, and discussion of its course and conditions. Since there have been street demonstrations in Germany, since there have been a number of letters from the front-lines in France urging *against* subscription to the war loan, since there

have been mass strikes in Britain, to say nothing of Russia, then, to promote this struggle, to help consolidate it on an international scale, it is absolutely necessary to shed light on *every* step along that road in a *free*, i.e., *illegal*, press, to verify the successes, to weigh their conditions, to strengthen and develop the struggle. Without an illegal organisation and an illegal press, recognition of "mass action" will remain (as it has remained in Switzerland) an empty phrase.*

14. On the question of the socialists' parliamentary action, it must be borne in mind that the Zimmerwald resolution not only expresses sympathy for the five Social-Democratic deputies of the Duma, who belong to our Party, and who have been sentenced to exile in Siberia, but also *expresses its solidarity* with their tactics. It is impossible to recognise the revolutionary struggle of the masses while being content with *exclusively* legal, *exclusively* reformist activity of socialists in parliament; this can only arouse legitimate dissatisfaction among the workers and cause them to desert Social-Democracy for anti-parliamentary anarchism or syndicalism. It must be stated clearly and publicly that Social-Democratic members of parliament must use their position *not only* to make speeches in parliament, but also to render all possible aid *outside parliament* to the underground organisation and the revolutionary struggle of the workers, and that the *masses* themselves, through their illegal organisation, must *supervise* the activity of their leaders.

15. The question of calling the International Socialist Bureau, placed on the agenda of the Second International Socialist Conference, which is being convened, inevitably raises a more fundamental question of principle, as to whether the old parties and the Second International can be united. The more extensive the mass sympathy for the Zimmerwald association, the more incomprehensible to the masses, the more harmful for the development of their struggle become the inconsistency and timidity of the stand which essentially identifies the old parties and the Second International with the bourgeois policy in the working-class movement (see the Zimmerwald Manifesto and the I.S.C.

* Points 12 and 13 are crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

circular of February 10, 1916), while fearing a split with them and promising to dissolve the I.S.C. as soon as the old International Socialist Bureau meets.

Such a promise *was never* voted on and was not discussed even at Zimmerwald.

The six months since Zimmerwald have made it even clearer that a split is inevitable, that the work which the Zimmerwald Manifesto recommends cannot be conducted in unity with the old parties, and that fear of a split is a brake on every step along that way. In Germany it is not only the I.S.D. group that has condemned the fear of a split and has openly come out against the hypocrisy of the apostles of unity, but also Otto Rühle, a *member of the Reichstagsfraktion** and Karl Liebknecht's closest friend, who has openly come out for a split. Nor was *Vorwärts* capable of putting forward against Rühle a single serious or honest argument. In France, member of the Socialist Party Bourderon spoke against a split, but in fact motioned a resolution at the Congress which "désapprouve (disavows) the C.A.P (Comité Administratif Permanent=the party C.C.) and the G.P." (Groupe Parlementaire=the parliamentary group). Adoption of such a resolution would clearly signify an immediate and unconditional split in the party. In Britain even T. Russel Williams, writing in the moderate *Labour Leader*, repeatedly and openly admitted the inevitability of a split, and received support from a number of party members. In America, where the Socialist Party is formally united, some of its members have come out for militarism and war (so-called preparedness), and others, including Eugene Debs, a former presidential candidate from the Socialist Party, openly preach civil war for socialism *in connection* with the coming war.

Actually, *there is* already a split throughout the world, and ignoring this fact would merely harm the Zimmerwaldists, making them ridiculous in the eyes of the masses, who are very well aware that every step of *t h e i r work* in the Zimmerwald spirit means a continuation and deepening of the split.

We must have the courage openly to recognise the inev-

* Parliamentary group.—*Ed.*

itable and the actual, to abandon any harmful illusions about the possibility of unity with the "defenders of their country" in the present war, and to help the masses escape the influence of the leaders who "are misleading them" (see the I.S.C. circular of February 10, 1916) or are hatching a "plot" (Pakt) *against* socialism through an "amnesty".

That is our proposal on the item of the agenda concerning the convocation of the International Socialist Bureau at The Hague.

* *
*

Reformist phrases are the main means of deceiving the people at a time when the objective situation has placed on the agenda of history the greatest world crisis, which, regardless of the will of the various parties, can either be deferred and postponed until the next imperialist war or resolved through socialist revolution. It is neither chance nor the ill will of the several governments or the capitalists of some country but the entire development of bourgeois relations that has led to imperialism and the present imperialist war. Similarly, it is neither chance nor the result of any demagogy or agitation but the objective conditions of the crisis brought about by the war and the sharpening of class contradictions that now generate strikes, demonstrations and other similar manifestations of mass revolutionary struggle in a number of belligerent countries.

Objectively, the question can only be put like this: are we to help this, still weak but intrinsically powerful and deep-going discontent and movement of the masses, which may develop into a socialist revolution, *or* are we to conduct a policy of helping the bourgeois governments (Durchhaltspolitik, politique jusquauboutiste*)? The real meaning of the sweet talk about democratic peace consists exclusively in *help* to the governments through the hypocritical stunning and fooling of the masses.

* *
*

This war has brought to the fore the basic problems of imperialism, i.e., of the very existence of capitalist society,

* The policy of continuing the war to a victorious end.—*Ed.*

and it would be quackery to suggest to the people, directly or indirectly, that these problems can have a reformist solution. It is a question of a redivision of the world corresponding to the new balance of power between the capitalist states, which in the last few decades have been developing not only very fast, but also—and this is especially important—very unevenly. On the basis of capitalist social relations, this new redivision of the world is impossible otherwise than through wars and violence. The objective state of things rules out any reformist solution for the ripe contradictions, it rules out any other way out except a series of imperialist wars or a socialist revolution of the proletariat, the conditions for whose success have already been created precisely by this epoch of imperialism. Real political activity in the given circumstances is possible only as this alternative: either to help your "own" national bourgeoisie plunder other countries or to help the beginning....*

Written in late February-March 1916

First published on November 6 and 7, 1927 in *Pravda* No. 255

Printed from the original

2

SPEECHES IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON CONVENING THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU[497]

APRIL 15 (28)

1

The Lugano conference was held in September 1914.[498] If Messrs. Huysmans & Co. wished to convene the Bureau, they could have done so long ago. But they have failed to do it. You deny the split between the sections of the old International, but the split is a fact. Today, we virtually have a crisis of all the socialist parties of the world. On the one hand, you treat Thomas & Co. as abject characters and traitors, and on the other hand, you say today: Oh, we

* Here the MS. breaks off.—*Ed.*

want to meet them, to discuss things and re-establish the International! What you say is empty talk: it is empty talk because it comes today, 16 months after Lugano. The men with whom you want to re-establish the International are dead, they no longer exist, not literally, but politically.

2

If Grimm thinks that everyone should not vote separately, we are quite willing to have the voting by groups. The last thing we want to do is to impose our will, but we want the voting to take place; after that we shall willingly take part in the work of the committees.

3

The question would have been solved long ago, if a vote had been taken. It is highly unfair that after many days of work together we have to forego the vote. After all, the vote would take no more than 5 minutes! Martov's proposal is acceptable without objections.[499]

First published in 1965 in Vol. 54 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the minutes of the conference
Translated from the German

ON THE DECLARATION BY THE POLISH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS AT THE ZIMMERWALD CONFERENCE[500]

This P.S.D. declaration at Zimmerwald shows that in opposing the right of nations to self-determination, the Polish Social-Democrats wish to say something quite different from what they are actually saying. They want to say that not every movement for national independence deserves Social-Democratic support. That is unquestionable both because any democratic demand is subordinate to the common interests of the proletariat's class struggle, without being at all absolute, and because in the epoch of imperi-

alist rivalries to dominate the nations there may well be open and secret alliances between the bourgeoisie of an oppressed country and an oppressor country.

Written in July 1916

First published in 1962 in Vol. 30 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

PLAN FOR AN ARTICLE "ON THE QUESTION OF THE ROLE OF THE STATE"[501]

On the Question of the Role of the State
Communist or Social-Democrat?
Socialism and communism. (Complete community of the articles of consumption or, at least, of the *necessities*.)
Democracy is also a state. Absterben.... "Withering away" of the state.
Why not Abschaffung* or Sprengung**?
"Allmähliches Einschlafen"*** of one function after another.
Without democracy = without administration of men.
"The state is rooted in the souls of the workers"?
Opportunism and revolutionary Social-Democracy.
Dictatorship of the proletariat.

Use of the state against the bourgeoisie.
Resistance to its attempts at restoration.
Revolutionary wars.
Introduction and defence of democracy.

The role of democracy:

Education of the masses
Their transition to the new system
Form of socialist revolution: *alliances* of 1905.

Imperialism: the state and the economic organisations of the capitalists. "State-capitalist trusts"....
Democratic reforms of the imperialists and socialist revolution.

* Destruction.—*Ed.*
** Explosion.—*Ed.*
*** "Gradual somnolence."—*Ed.*

Marx in 1844 (*Nachlass*, II. Band, S. 50,* end of last but one paragraph).[502]

> Nothing except an antithesis between socialism and politics. Against Ruge's purely political radicalism. Until 1847!

Engels ("Dell' Autorità"**) on revolution... (+)
on organisation....[503] (+)

Marx (ebenda***) ((*Neue Zeit*, 32, I, 1913-1914)) on political influence and struggle for **concessions**—on the revolutionary use of the state power....[504]

Two directions in *politics* (politics is participation in the affairs of *state*, direction of the state, definition of the forms, tasks and content of state activity), opportunist and revolutionary, or two trends in the attitude to the "state"?

The democracy of the reformists and the democracy of the revolution. Two different contents: minority and the mass. Appeasing the mass? Helping the mass *struggle*? Subordination of the mass to the authority of the leaders? Revolt against the leaders? Engels's "lower mass" *versus* "mass" *behind* opportunist leaders. Boils down to revolution versus opportunism.

Written not earlier than November 18 (December 1) 1916

First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXI*

Printed from the original

THESES ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE SWISS SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO THE WAR****[505]

Practical Section

(1) Complete repudiation of defence of country both from the military and the political standpoint, and ruthless exposure of the bourgeois lies behind this slogan.

* *Legacy*, Vol. II, p. 50.—*Ed.*
** "On Authority."—*Ed.*
*** Ibidem.—*Ed.*
**** See present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 149-51.—*Ed.*

(2) Unconditional rejection of all war credits and demands both in time of peace and of war, and with a motivation of principle. Impose the duty of doing this on the party's representatives in parliament and in all other state institutions.

(3) Struggle in all the party's propaganda and agitation—above all in practical activity—against all military establishments, and repudiation of all military duties to the bourgeois class state.

(4) Systematic transition by the party to revolutionary struggle and revolutionary tactics all along the line, instead of being confined to reformism in practical activity.

(5) Adoption of the work and activity of Karl Liebknecht and the whole Spartacus group in Germany[506] as a model of the only international activity, of real struggle against the war and all wars, and emulation of their example.

(6) Struggle by means of propaganda, agitation and organisation against the social-patriots (i.e., "defenders of their country") and reformists (i.e., opponents of the immediate application of revolutionary means of struggle) within the Swiss Socialist Party.

(7) Explaining to the masses that all solemn declarations against militarism and war inevitably come to empty talk without a complete change in the party's structure and activity and without control by the resolute opponents of social-patriotism and reformism of all the posts in the socialist-political and also trade union, consumer and all other working-class organisations.

(8) Propaganda and preparation of a vigorous revolutionary mass struggle (demonstrations, strikes *and so on*, depending on the growth of the overall revolutionary struggle) for the purposes of the proletarian revolution as the only means of doing away with wars.

(9) Explaining to the masses that in case of necessity they must themselves set up from below special organisations for such struggle adapted to the hard conditions of wartime.

(10) Making sure that the party's revolutionary tasks in the struggle against the high cost of living, war, etc., are known and clear to every section of the exploited people outside the party.

(11) Systematic propaganda in this context among young people of pre-conscription age, and also in the army, etc.

Written in German in late November-early December 1916

First published in 1931 in *Lenin Miscellany XVII*

Printed from the original
Translated from the German

REMARKS ON AN ARTICLE ABOUT MAXIMALISM[507]

Page 6 (Paragraph 2). Here there should be an insertion saying that Potresov has now *in fact* disavowed these propositions (of Kautsky + Hilferding, etc.) containing a repudiation of reformism in principle. Potresov has become a reformist.

(It is not right to confine oneself to the statement: "we have never had the intention of proving"; this should be put forward as *p r o v e d*, and Potresov should be challenged: you and especially Maslov & Co. of *Dyelo*[508] have in fact, but tacitly, like cowards, altogether gone over from *this position* to reformism.)

Page 7 (end of § I) "mass action"?? It would be better to put this otherwise, without using this word which has the fault that, being *largely* caused by the *G e r m a n* censorship (a pseudonym for *revolution*), it tends to obscure the concept of *revolution*. (There will have to be a reckoning on this later with Pannekoek + Radek & Co.!! Here is an example: there is no German censorship in Switzerland and here the term "mass action" has *a l r e a d y* brought about confusion which the reformists find useful.)

But that is not the main thing. The main point is in your idea, which is *basically incorrect*, that "those of its (minimum programme) demands ... add up to a *transition* to a basically different social system" (page 7, § II, *e t a l.*) (idem, p. *9*).

That is quite wrong!! *N e v e r* is a "transition to a basically different social system" achieved *e i t h e r* by the definite demands of the minimum programme ("those of its demands") *o r t h e s u m t o t a l* of the minimum-

programme demands. To think so is to move over to the reformist position in principle and to abandon the standpoint of the socialist revolution.

The minimum programme is one which is in principle *compatible* with capitalism and *does not go beyond* its framework.

You may have wanted to say that where society is objectively mature for socialism, the implementation of the *sum total* of the minimum-programme demands *would produce* socialism. But even that is not so. The only thing that can be said is that *it is most probable* in practice that out of any serious struggle for the *major* minimum-programme demands *there will flare up* a struggle for socialism and that *we*, at any rate, are working in that direction.

Another thing should not be forgotten, and this is something Pannekoek + Radek do forget, namely, that imperialism is the exploitation of hundreds of millions in the dependent nations by a handful of very rich nations. Hence, the *possibility* of full democracy inside the richest nation *with its continued* domination over dependent nations. That was the state of things in ancient Greece on the basis of slavery. That is how things now stand with New Zealand and Britain.

(By the way: page 8 is not good. That's *not* the way to put it. For instance, in the epoch of imperialism and the high cost of living "bread" is precisely the thing you will not get through reform *alone*.

Page 8—defence against Potresov's charge. The thing to do is not to defend yourself, but to attack: *you confine yourself* to reforms, as the liberals did in Russia in 1904.)

Page 10—in 1905, the liberals *confined themselves* to reforms; we demanded, preached, prepared, etc., the revolution. Here it is not a question of "concreteness", but of the basic principle (essence) of any revolution: displacement of the old class and winning of "*all power*" (*der* Macht) *by the new* class.

(Page 10 bottom—you deal with the proletarian "reform" in a terribly clumsy and imprudent way, although you do want to say: "revolution"!! What you should say is perhaps: "As in Russia in 1904 it is not reforms but a *reform*.")

Page 11 is all quite wrong. *Imperialism* will produce both the 8-hour working day and the "arming of the people"

against the socialist revolution. That is precisely the point over which the struggle will *not* unfold. And, in general, it will not be over the minimum programme.

Imperialism will produce "Bulygin Dumas" and reforms *against* the revolution. We shall be for the revolution.

"The most important questions of the present day" will *n o t* be and are *n o t* those you name, but the high cost of living (1) + (2) imperialist wars.

Reforms are powerless against the high cost of living (in the presence of the trusts, etc.), as they were against the autocracy in Russia in 1904-05.

You have incorrectly put the question of reform, and of the minimum programme, and of democracy.

⁂ I very strongly recommend rewriting it, confining yourself, *for the time being* (for a small article in *Voprosy Strakhovaniya*), to the antithesis: You, Mr. Potresov, are a full-fledged **reformist**, you confine yourself to "reforms", you *h a v e f o r g o t t e n* the significance and meaning of the "formula": "not reforms, but a reform", the significance and meaning of the quoted statements by Kautsky + Hilferding + + Bauer, etc. *Dyelo* = ideologically quite mature organ of *reformism*, of the bourgeois labour party.

The "three pillars"[509] *before* the revolution were an extension of the struggle for reform. And that is exactly how the question is formulated in the Manifesto of the Zimmerwald Left: all struggle for reform must be channeled and transformed *into struggle* for revolution.

I do not think self-determination of nations should be set out as the "most important" in general: in so doing you go miles beyond what we have been saying until now. By coming out in this way you would force me to join up against you with—oh, horrible thought!—Bukharin!!!

Isn't it better to leave this question aside for the time being, rewriting the article à la ⁂ —and to work out something in the form of theses, let us say, on the attitude to the minimum programme, etc., for dispatch to the Bureau, etc.?

⁂ Phrases about "maximalism" are nothing but attacks by a *reformist* on the *revolutionaries* ("opponents of reformism

in principle" for the censorship). In general, it is an exceptionally difficult thing and heikle sehr heikle Sache!!* to treat of *s u c h* a question in the censored press.

Written after December 7 (20), 1916

First published in 1962 in Vol. 30 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

PLANS FOR A PAMPHLET *STATISTICS AND SOCIOLOGY***

S t a t i s t i c s and **Sociology**

1

A) Historical conditions of national movements.
B) Some theoretical questions relating to national movements.
C) Right of nations to self-determination and Rosa Luxemburg.
D) Cultural-national autonomy.

A) Historical conditions of national movements....	**A.** *Historical background to national movements* (p. 2***)
succession of epochs; types of countries as historical stages in this succession....	Chapter 1. Some statistics *p. 4.* I and II p. 8****
	2. Three "types" of countries.... (Types—historical stages.)
B) Some theoretical questions [Some unsettled ques-	"State of nationalities?" [stage of completed national

* A ticklish, a very ticklish matter!!—*Ed.*
** See present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 271-77.—*Ed.*
*** A reference to page. 2 of the pamphlet MS. (see ibid., pp. 271-73).—*Ed.*
**** Ibid., pp. 273-76, 276-77.—*Ed.*

tions?] relating to national movements.

movements....]
3. Imperialism and division of the world....
(diagram?)
4. Rule: oppressor and oppressed nations....
5. "System of states...."
{{ system of national states
system of imperialist states }}

(1)

B. [On the concept of feasibility]

1. "Feasibility" of self-determination.

(2) 2 **bis:** "Dualism" and monism....

2. National wars in the "epoch" of imperialism.
{ Hilferding.[510] Concept of "epoch".
Patouillet.
Junius.[511] }
to A. → 6.

(3)

[Annexations and colonies]

3. Annexations and self-determination.
4. Colonies and self-determination.
7. Concurrence of imperialist and national wars....
America 1783—the "possible" and the real.

(4)

[Lensch's arguments]

{ 5. Lensch vs. Struve. Lensch's "arguments....[512]
6. Engels on the 1866 treaty (separate sheet).... }

(5)

{ 7. Imperialist Economism and "ultra-imperialism"....

(6)

{ 8. The state and state construction.
9. Democracy and socialism.
10. Minimum and maximum.

(7)

[11. Social-chauvinism vs. Kautskyism on the question of self-determination and imperialism.]

---

*These words are in English in the original.—*Ed.*

(8) United States of Europe: ...

Patouillet (Wilhelm II)....
Colonies.

(9) Social-pacifism as embellishment of imperialism (K. Kautsky. Dec. 1916).[513]

2

Distinction between the oppress*or* and the oppress*ed* countries

+ Marx on Ireland *1869* (from "Beiträge zur Biographie"[514])	European states and colonies in 18*76* and 19*16*. "It wasn't worth while emancipating the Negroes" (Wirth). Marx on the state: "*der heutige* Staat"* ?? (NB)
+ Engels about the 1866 treaty and its abrogation (separate sheet).	"Law" of state concentration????
+ Lensch's "arguments" (his 2 articles)....	National specifics of oppressed nations (Wirth on Ireland). Engels on Ireland in the event of war between America and Britain. *Neue Zeit* 1915-16?
	..."Imperialist Economism".... "Ultra-imperialism".... } Two absurdities
"Era of national wars" (Patouillet and Junius)	"There can be no national wars" in the imperialist "epoch". (To make it stronger!) Concept of "epoch"....

* "The modern state."—*Ed.*

3

Old and new studies of the national question:

To **A:**

1. Three "types" of countries.
2. "Types" = historical stages.
3. Uneven development.

{{ "State of nationalities." Incompleteness of this concept. }}

To **B**
- Furtherance of reforms: Bismarck vs. 1848
- Imperialist war of 1914-17 vs. 1848 (!!!)
- Imperialism and division of the world
- Imperialist wars on the basis of slavery, etc.
- Concurrence of imperialist and national wars.

Historical conditions of national movements

Etwa
- *A*. Some statistics. (Facts are stubborn things.*)
- *B*. Theoretical mistakes in the reasoning of some Marxists on the national question.
- *C*. Right of nations to self-determination and Rosa Luxemburg. } old studies....
- *D*. Cultural-national autonomy. } old studies....

To **B:**

Imperialism and the national question.
"*F e a s i b i l i t y*" of national self-determination.
Annexations and national self-determination.
Colonies and national self-determination.
The state and state construction.
"Dualism" and "monism" in the national question.
Diversity of movements towards a single goal.
"Get out of the colonies"??
Socialism and colonies (Engels 1882).
Jewry—nation?
Integration of nations?

Written in January 1917
First published in 1931 in *Lenin Miscellany XXX*
Printed from the original

* The last three words are in English in the original—*Ed.*

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CENTRE AS A TREND IN INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY[515]

In Grimm:

Characteristics of the Centre
as a trend in international Social-Democracy:

\+ 1. No rupture with the social-patriots of *one's own* country either on basic principles, or in organisation; hence 2.

\+ 2. Against split.

(+—) 3. Evasiveness on the question of defence of country.

\+ 4. Recognition of Zimmerwald and Kienthal—without a split with the I.S.B. and international social-patriotism .

\+ 5. No break with reformism: only verbal criticism of it ("passiver Radikalismus"*).

\+ 6. Adoption of a *wait-and-see* attitude (*not* active, *not* with initiative as the Left) on the coming revolution (in *connection* with *the present* war).

\+ (ΣΣ)

(?=§1) 7. ΣΣ=prettifying (and defending) social-patriotism in varying measure and by diverse means, such is the *essence* (wesen) of the Centre....

\+ 8. No reconstruction of the present Social-Democratic parties and trade unions, nothing like Liebknecht's "regeneration from top to bottom". Deferring this question.

(—) 9. Social-pacifism as programme and tactics.

\+ 10. No systematic propaganda of revolution in connection with the present war.

\+ 11. No preparation of organisations, etc., for such a revolution.

—α) *Avanti!* March 6, 1916
β) Morgari in Swiss newspaper
γ) social-pacifism
+αα) social-patriots exclusively
ββ) the young.

---

* "Passive radicalism."—*Ed.*

In putting Liebknecht and the Italian Socialist Party side by side, Grimm tends to confuse the Centre and the Left.

Grimm wants to solve a revolutionary problem (struggle against war) by reformist means ("schwächenn, erschweren, etc.*).

Indirect tax, November 4-5, 1916.

Reformist struggle against high cost of living (August 6, 1916).

Polemics against** ("Sozialismus tut not"***).

Idem reformism — Hushing up of social-patriotism in the Swiss Socialist Party. Absence of struggle against it.

Idem in trade union movement (Schneeberger & Dürr).

NB — Question of the *m o m e n t* of revolutionary action *i s c o n f u s e d* with that of systematic propaganda and agitational and organisational preparation for possibility of revolutionary action in general.

Lying, dishonest dodges with Entwaffnung**** (cf. his own "theses"). Idem Diensterweigerung.*****

Dodges on the question of was heisst "*verweigern*" die *Leipziger Volkszeitung*? Verzerrung der Frage *s e i t e n s* Grütli-Verein.*)

NB: Paying *lip service* to Zimmerwald + Kienthal and *carrying on as before* in fact!!

Page 13. From the standpoint of the Centre in general it would be *c o n s i s t e n t* in Switzerland to stand *for* defence of the country!!!**)

Written in January 1917

First published in full in 1962 in Vol. 30 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from the original

---

* Weakening, complication, etc.—*Ed.*

** The next word is illegible.—*Ed.*

*** "Socialism is necessary."—*Ed.*

**** Disarmament.—*Ed.*

***** Refusal to do military service.—*Ed.*

*) What does *Leipziger Volkszeitung* call "*refusal*"? Distortion of the question *o n t h e p a r t* of Grütli-Verein.—*Ed.*

**) Here the MS. breaks off.—*Ed.*

PLAN FOR AN ARTICLE "THE LESSONS OF THE WAR"[516]

The Lessons of the War

Etwa:

1. Definition of imperialism.
2. The imperialist character of the war has been exposed.
3. Advance of monopoly capitalism towards state capitalism.
4. "Necessity" teaches. Famine, etc.
5. Female labour. "Arbeitszwang", etc. "Kriegssozialismus"?*
6. Social-patriotism or social-chauvinism. International significance.
7. Kautskyism or Centrism or social-pacifism.
8. The Left.

8 *bis*. Basle Manifesto. *Refuted*?

9. Socio-economic approach. "Not kennt kein Gebot."** Either socialism or famine (idem Neutrale***).
10. Wie's gemacht wird? "Wumba."****
11. Political tasks: resolution.
12. Civil war. Waffen umkehren. ("Entwaffnung der Arbeiter"?)*****
13. "Break up the old state" machine (Kautsky gegen Pannekoek).
14. "Dictatorship of the proletariat." 1871 and 1905.
15. The old, "ready-made" state power or a *new* one?
16. "Soviets of Workers' Deputies." Is that parliamentarism?
17. The role of *new* democracy and its withering away.

---

* "Forced labour", etc. "War socialism"?—*Ed.*

** "Necessity knows no laws."—*Ed.*

*** Neutral.—*Ed.*

**** How is it done? "Wumba" (Department for the Supply of Arms and Munitions).—*Ed.*

***** Turn weapons. ("Disarmament of workers"?)—*Ed.*

17 bis. "New" democracy ("neue Schöpfung"*)= one which is working, socialist, proletarian and *communist.*

18. Moments, elements, indications of a turn towards revolution.

M. Capy, urb. Gohier
R. Rolland

The North American Review.
The Atlantic Monthly?

Subjects: **A.** Imperialism and imperialist war (1-2).
B. Three trends in international socialism (6-8).
C. Development of the economy (3-5).
D. "Feasibility" and urgency of socialism.
E. Political revolution (11-17).
F. "Der Sturm naht"** (18).

Written in February 1917

First published in 1939 in the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolutsia* No. 1

Printed from the original

OUTLINE OF FIFTH "LETTER FROM AFAR"[517]

The old programme *will not do* for the elections to the Constituent Assembly. It should be altered:

1) add about imperialism as the final stage of capitalism
2) about the imperialist war, imperialist wars and "defence of one's country"
+2 *bis*: about the struggle and the split with the social-chauvinists
NB 3) add about the *state*, the kind we need, and about the *withering away* of the state.

* "New creativity."—*Ed.*
** "The storm approaches."—*Ed.*

4) Change
two last paragraphs *before* the political programme
(against the monarchy in general and measures to restore it)
5) add to § 3 of the political section:
no officials from *the top*
(cf. *Engels* in his criticism of 1891[518])
\+ salaries to *all* officials: not higher than workers' wages
\+ right to recall *all* deputies and officials at any time
\+ 5 bis) correct § 9 on self-determination
\+ international character of socialist revolution in *detail*
6) correct and *raise* many things in minimum programme.
7) In agrarian programme:
(α) nationalisation instead of municipalisation
(I shall send my MS. on this, which was burnt in 1909,[519] to St. Petersburg)
(β) model farms on landed estates.
8) "Universal labour service" (Zivildienstpflicht)
9) cross out support for "*every opposition*" movement (a revolutionary one is a different matter).
10) Change name, because
(α) it is wrong
(β) it has been fouled by the social-chauvinists
(γ) it will confuse the people at the elections, because the Social-Democrats = Chkheidze, *Potresov* & Co.

This is an outline of "letter No. 5". Please return **at once.**
Do you happen to have any outlines or notes for changing the practical section of the minimum programme? ((Do you remember us discussing this *many times*?))
This work should be started **right away.**

Written between March 7 and 12 (20 and 25), 1917

First published in 1959 in *Lenin Miscellany XXXVI*

Printed from the original

REPLIES TO A CORRESPONDENT OF THE NEWSPAPER *POLITIKEN*[520] MARCH 31 (APRIL 13), 1917

Our friends did not wish to give any interviews. Instead of an interview, the arrivals have handed through *Politiken* a communiqué on the trip to the press and the public.

The most important thing for us is to arrive in Russia *as soon as possible*, Lenin said warmly. Every day counts. The governments have done everything to hamper this trip.

Did you meet any of the comrades from the German party?

No. Wilhelm Jansson from Berlin tried to meet us at Lingen on the Swiss border. But Platten refused permission, giving a friendly hint that he wished to spare Jansson the unpleasantness of such a meeting.

Politiken No, 85, April 14, 1917

Printed from the *Politiken* text
Translated from the Swedish

REPLY TO F. STRÖM, A SPOKESMAN OF THE LEFT-WING SWEDISH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS MARCH 31 (APRIL 13), 1917

It is a downright invention to say that Frederik Ström, allegedly contrary to the wishes of the Russians, had prevented a representative of *Socialdemokraten*[521] from attending the conference. To Ström's question, Lenin replied:

We have absolutely no trust in Mr. Branting. If *you* have trust in him, you are free to invite his representative.

Politiken No, 86, April 15, 1917

Printed from the *Politiken* text
Translated from the Swedish

RUSSIAN REVOLUTIONARIES' TRIP ACROSS GERMANY

COMMUNIQUÉ OF THE GROUP[522]

The Russian revolutionaries who arrived in Stockholm on Friday morning handed to *Politiken* for publication the following official communiqué concerning their trip:

Britain, which officially welcomed the Russian revolution with "joy in her heart", at once did everything to nullify *one* of the results of the revolution—the *political amnesty*. The British Government does not allow transit to Russia for Russian revolutionaries who live abroad and who oppose the war. When this had been proved beyond doubt—this fact has been confirmed by numerous documents which will be made public in the very near future, and Russian socialists of *all* trends have stated as much in a unanimous resolution—a section of the Russian Party comrades decided to try to return from Switzerland to Russia via Germany and Sweden. *Fritz Platten*, Secretary of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party and the leader of its Left Wing, a well-known internationalist and anti-militarist, conducted negotiations with the German Government. For their trip the Russian Party comrades demanded the *right of extraterritoriality* (no inspection of passports or luggage; no officials allowed into their car). The group of those who travelled could include anyone, regardless of political views, provided the Russians themselves approved of his candidature. The Russian Party comrades declared that in return they would demand the release of Austrian and German civilians interned in Russia.

The German Government accepted the terms, and 30 Russian Party comrades, men and women, left Gottmadingen on April 9, including *Lenin* and *Zinoviev*, editors of *Sotsial-Demokrat*, the Central Organ of Russian Social-Democracy; *Mikha Tskhakaya*, editor of *Nachalo*[523] in Paris and a founder of the Caucasian Social-Democratic organisation, who had earlier brought Chkheidze into the party, and also several members of the Jewish Workers' Union. *Fritz Platten* was in charge of the trip and he alone conducted all the necessary negotiations with the representatives of the German Government who accompanied the train.

During the three-day crossing of Germany, the Russian Party comrades did not leave their car. The agreement was strictly honoured by the German authorities. On the 12th instant, the Russians arrived in Sweden.

Before their departure from Switzerland, a record was made of all the preparations for the trip. Having studied this document, *Henri Guilbeaux*, representing the French Social-Democratic group "Vie Ouvrière" and editor of *Demain*[524]; a leader of the radical French opposition in Paris, whose name cannot now be divulged[525]; *Paul Hartstein*, a member of the radical German opposition; *M. Bronski*, representing Russian-Polish Social-Democracy, and *Fritz Platten* signed a statement voicing their full approval of the way in which the Russian Party comrades had acted.

Written on March 31 (April 13),
Published on April 14, 1917
in the newspaper *Politiken* No. 85

Published in Russian in part on April 5 (18), 1917 in the newspapers *Dyen* No. 25 and *Rech* No. 78

Printed from the *Politiken* text
Translated from the Swedish

SPEECH AT A CONFERENCE WITH LEFT-WING SWEDISH SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS MARCH 31 (APRIL 13), 1917[526]

NEWSPAPER REPORT

On behalf of the Russian comrades, *Lenin* voiced his thanks for the welcome and said that a congress of the Russian Socialist Party due to be called shortly would put forward an international proposal. Close ties would be maintained with the Swedish comrades, especially with *Politiken*.

Politiken No, 86,
April 15, 1917

Printed from the *Politiken* text
Translated from the Swedish

SPEECH IN THE FINLAND STATION SQUARE TO WORKERS, SOLDIERS AND SAILORS APRIL 3 (16), 1917

NEWSPAPER REPORT

In the street, standing on top of an armoured car, Comrade Lenin greeted the revolutionary Russian proletariat and the revolutionary Russian army, who had succeeded not only in liberating Russia from tsarist despotism, but in starting a social revolution on an international scale, and added that the proletariat of the whole world looked with hope to the Russian proletariat's bold steps.

The whole crowd walked in a body behind the car to the Kshesinskaya mansion, where the meeting continued.

Pravda No. 24, April 5, 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

"LIBERTY LOAN"[527]

(DRAFT RESOLUTION WORKED OUT BY THE BOLSHEVIK GROUP OF THE SOVIET OF WORKERS' DEPUTIES)

Resolution of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies Concerning the 4th "Liberty Loan"

In virtue of the fact that the present war is a predatory imperialist war, that its character has not changed at all since power in Russia passed to the capitalist Provisional Government, and that the secret treaties of the allied powers, which determine the true aims of the war, remain in force—the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies protests most vigorously against the so-called "liberty loan" and refuses to support the Provisional Government in its intentions to drag out the war, which benefits no one but the imperialist bourgeoisie.

If the workers of all countries of the world vote for the loans issued by their bourgeois governments to wage the imperialist war, it will be impossible to find a way out of the horrors of the war, and all talk about the fraternal

solidarity of the proletariat of the world, about internationalism, etc., will come to nothing but hypocrisy.

The coupling of votes for the loan with wishes, statements, declarations, etc., in favour of peace without annexations is especially clear evidence of the disastrous discrepancy between word and deed, which has destroyed the Second International.

Until political and economic power has passed into the hands of the proletariat and the poor sections of the peasantry, and while the aim of the war is determined by the interests of capital, the workers reject any new loans aimed not for but against Russia's revolutionary freedom.

Recognising at the same time that the supply of the army with all necessities calls for resources, and not wishing to leave their brothers without bread for a single hour, the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies believes that the cost of the capitalist war should be borne by the capitalists who have reaped and continue to reap billions of rubles in profits on this war, and insists that the necessary money should come exclusively from the pockets of the bourgeoisie and the landowners.

Written on April 11 (24), 1917

Published on April 13, 1917 in *Pravda* No. 31

Printed from the *Pravda* text

PETROGRAD CITY R.S.D.L.P.(B.) CONFERENCE[528]

APRIL 14-22 (APRIL, 27-MAY 5), 1917

1

REPORT OF THE PRE SENT SITUATION AND THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL, GOVERNMENT APRIL 14 (27)

NEWSPAPER REPORT

The old traditional formulas (dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry) no longer meet the changed conditions. A revolutionary-democratic dictatorship has been

established but not in the form we envisaged: it is interlocked with the dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie. The imperialist war has confused everything, turning the rabid opponents of the revolution—the Anglo-French capitalists—into supporters of the revolution for victory (the same applies to the top army command and counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie).

It is this unique historical concurrence of circumstances that has brought about a dual dictatorship: the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of revolutionary democracy. In organisational terms, the people have never managed to keep abreast of the bourgeoisie; in Russia the people have set up their own organised power without having achieved political independence. Hence, the dual power, the unconsciously trusting attitude on the part of the petty-bourgeois majority of the soldier masses and a section of the workers to the Provisional Government, and the voluntary submission of revolutionary democracy to the bourgeois dictatorship. The specific feature of the present situation is that lack of political awareness on the part of the masses is preventing the establishment of a stable and conscious majority on the side of the proletarian policy (all other political trends have gone over entirely to the petty-bourgeois position). The revolutionary democracy is an assembly of the most diverse elements (in terms of class *status* and *interests*, which is not the same thing at all!). Their stratification: in the countryside—the well-to-do peasants, who have been strengthened by the November 9 law, and the poor, one-horse and horseless peasants, and in the towns—the sections close to the working class and the petty proprietors; the separation of the proletarians and the *semi*-proletarians from the petty bourgeoisie is inevitable, but the consolidation of the propertied elements in the revolutionary bloc may well advance to a point where it will prevail over the organisation of the masses rallying round the proletarian slogans. It is quite possible, therefore, that power will remain in the hands of the bourgeoisie, and that there will be no transfer of power to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The conclusion: we are not faced with the task of overthrowing the Provisional Government—it rests on the *confidence* of the petty-bourgeois and

a section of the workers' masses—but with that of painstaking explanation of the class tasks and organisation.

Pravda No. 40,
May 8 (April 25), 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

2

SPEECH IN MOVING A RESOLUTION ON THE WAR
APRIL 22 (MAY 5)

The resolution on the war was drafted in the committee, but the final version is yet to be worked out. I think that in its final wording the resolution will be put before the general Party conference, and I now move that it be read out in its present form.

The resolution consists of three parts: 1) objective causes of the war, 2) revolutionary defencism, and 3) how to end the war.

First published in 1925 in the book *Petrogradskaya obshchegorodskaya i Vserossiiskaya konferentsii R.S.D.R.P.(B.) v aprele 1917 goda* (Petrograd City and All-Russia Conferences of the R.S.D.L.P.[B.], April 1917)

Printed from a typewritten copy of the minutes

SPEECH AT A MEETING OF SOLDIERS OF AN ARMOURED BATTALION IN MIKHAILOVSKY MANÈGE
APRIL 15 (28), 1917

NEWSPAPER REPORT

We Social-Democrats who take the standpoint of international socialism, are being accused of having returned to Russia via Germany, of having been bribed by the Germans and of being traitors to the national cause, the cause of freedom.

Who is saying all this? Who is spreading these lies and slander?

Soldiers and workers who read the working-class newspapers are aware that a decision of the Soviet which was taken after a hearing of the report by Comrade Zinoviev

and Comrade Zurabov on how we managed to make our way across Germany, was published in *Izvestia Sovieta Rabochikh i Soldatskikh Deputatovs*[529] No. 32, of April 5, 1917.

Did the Soviet reprimand us? No. What did the Soviet say? It replied that it wanted the Provisional Government to take urgent measures for the unhampered passage to Russia of all Russian political exiles living abroad.

Comrade Lenin then stated that until now the Provisional Government has failed to take any measures and that our socialist comrades living abroad could not return to Russia. Why? Simply because Britain, who has a stake in this fratricidal slaughter, has refused to allow passage for our socialist comrades, socialists who have declared war against war and demand peace. The British are keeping in prison one of their own British socialists,[530] and have also arrested and imprisoned our Comrade Trotsky, who was Chairman of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies in 1905.

But that is precisely what has been done by all the capitalist and landowner governments favouring this war: the French, the German and the Italian governments have thrown all anti-war socialists into prison and are keeping them there.

Was it possible in the circumstances to travel via Britain? No. That is why we had to apply to the Swiss socialist Platten, who also favours peace.

What was the upshot of this?

Lenin and those who travelled with him were let through, but our witness, Comrade Platten, who could testify that we had had no contacts with the Germans, was not allowed to come to Russia.

What is the point of all this?

It is that this war, which is now taking hundreds of thousands of lives a month, is being waged by the capitalists—they stand to gain from the war, they are profiting from it, and that is why all those who want peace and work for it are being imprisoned by the capitalists of all countries, including the brigand and plunderer Wilhelm, who spread lies and slander about the socialists.

Comrade Lenin then went on to give a detailed explanation of the causes of the war and its aims. He showed that

the working class and the poor peasants have never wanted and do not want this or any other war. He also spoke in detail about the nature of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and of the Provisional Government, on which the industrialist Guchkov and the landowners have seats.

Support and help should not go to the Provisional Government, but to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which is the only legitimate government and which alone expresses the people's interests.

Soldatskaya Pravda No. 2
April 18 (May 1), 1917

Printed from the
Soldatskaya Pravda
text

MEETING OF THE SOLDIERS' SECTION OF THE PETROGRAD SOVIET OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES

APRIL 17 (30), 1917 [531]

1

SPEECH ON THE RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMISSION OF THE SOVIET OF SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES

Lenin says that he has read the resolution of the Executive Commission and the Committee on his activity and has decided to insert his article on this resolution in *Pravda*; just now he wishes to reply briefly to the charges being levelled against him. He finds that there are four questions to which he wants to reply: 1) formal question, 2) question of land, 3) of the government, 4) of the war.

On the first question he welcomes the silence of the resolution on his trip across Germany, as it shows that the Commission has taken the standpoint of both sections of the Committee, which say nothing about it. He reads an extract from the resolution: "...considers the propaganda of so-called Leninists, etc." and declares that he assumes full responsibility for the Leninists' propaganda. To reply to this charge in the resolution, the three above-mentioned questions must be examined. He goes on to explain these

questions. On the question of land—he favours the transfer of all land to the use of the working masses without redemption; he speaks about the transfer by decision of peasant committees, and refers to Shingaryov's telegram, which says that the taking away of land is an arbitrary act. That is wrong because it has been done by decision of the village committees, which makes the seizure legal. It is naive to think that the peasants can be influenced by sermons from Petrograd; that is impossible. The question of land will be decided on the spot. The land should be taken over right away, in view of the looming famine. Voluntary agreement with the landowners is an absurdity, you cannot have an agreement between 300 peasant families and one landowner, which is the ratio we now have in European Russia.

(*A proposal is motioned to limit the speaker's time. Statements are made for and against; by a vote the time is limited to 30 minutes.*)

Lenin says that if the meeting wishes it, he could alter the time of the explanations, but could also be through within 20 minutes.

On the state structure and administration he says that we need a people's republic, and not one with officials, capitalists and troops. Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Farm Labourers' Deputies, from top to bottom, that is the ideal of administration. The people must have the power. On the question of the war he says that he has never spoken about the draft reinforcements and knows nothing of the question at all.[532] That is why he speaks only about the war. Our government consists only of capitalists, the war is being waged to benefit the capitalists, and the war can be ended only through a revolution by the workers' masses. The obligations undertaken by our allies are predatory, they deal only with a sharing of the spoils; annexation is connected with capital, and cannot be repudiated until capital is taken over. He holds the capitalists in Germany to be the same as our own capitalists, and says that Wilhelm is a bloodsucker and, of course, there can be no question of a separate peace with him—that is absurd. The capitalists started the war and cannot end it—there is need for a workers' revolution to end the war. The Leninists are

against any separate peace. They said as much back in 1915. They said that the proletariat, once it takes power, and publishes all the treaties, must offer peace to the whole world.* If anyone rejects such peace, the proletariat will start a revolutionary war. Only a revolution by workers in several countries can put an end to the war. Universal peace can be achieved only through a workers' revolution, The practical method of ending the war is fraternisation at the front, and strengthening the power of the Soviet of Workers', Peasants' and Farm Labourers' Deputies. That is the only way to bring about the workers' revolution and universal peace.

2

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

1) The reconquest of Kurland is annexation, because in that case Germany is entitled to reconquer her colonies. The people must be left to decide for themselves how they want to live. In the capitalist world the sharing out is according to strength—the stronger get more. It is not worth while fighting over Kurland, but it is worth while fighting for Kurland's freedom to decide whom she wants to join.

2) On the seizure of banks and money. He urges that the seizures should not be arbitrary but by decision of the majority. (*Shouts from the audience*: "Your doctrine leads to a primitive state".)—No! (*Question*: "What is to be done if other countries want peace?")—Advance of the workers' revolution and fraternisation at the front.

Tactics—we must see how life goes forward. The experience of life is the best thing. We must develop the Russian revolution in such a way that the workers', peasants' and farm labourers' deputies have the power. (*Another question*: "Is that what you preached in Germany? We, that is, Zinoviev and I, published a pamphlet[533] abroad, in which we said precisely what we are saying now; we published it in German and the German socialists circulated it in Germany.

First published in full in 1962 in Vol. 31 or the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from a typewritten copy of the minutes

* See present edition, Vol. 21, p. 403.—*Ed.*

THE ATTENTION OF COMRADES!

Comrades Lashevich, Krymov and Mavrin, authorised by the Bolshevik group of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, request us to declare that the overwhelming majority of the workers who took part in the manifestations on April 20 and 21 and carried "Down with the Provisional Government!" placards, understood this slogan to mean exclusively that all power should be transferred to the Soviets and that the workers want to take over only after winning a majority in the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The present composition of the Soviet does not quite express the will of the majority of the workers' and soldiers' masses. That is why the Bolshevik group believes that the C.C. resolution of April 22 does not give a precise characteristic of the present state of affairs.

From the Editors. It goes without saying that the C.C. resolution is in no sense aimed against the organisers of the mass demonstrations, and that such an interpretation of the slogan rules out any idea of thoughtlessness or adventurism. At any rate, the peaceful and impressively massive character of these manifestations is to the great credit of these comrades as representing the organisers of the manifestations. They alone organised a fitting rebuff to the bourgeoisie, which was demonstrating in favour of *its own* Provisional Government.

Written on April 22 (May 5), 1917

Published on May 6 (April 23), 1917 in *Pravda* No. 39

Printed from the *Pravda* text

POGROM AGITATION IN MINISTERIAL NEWSPAPER

The ministerial gentlemen, having secured a fresh expression of confidence on the part of the majority of the Soviet leaders, have started a fresh offensive against *Pravda* and against our Party.

Rech, the ministerial newspaper, has adopted the worst methods of *Russkaya Volya*.[534]

In today's two editorials, the ministerial newspaper, rehearsing the *Russkaya Volya* elements, does enough lying for two papers.

"The whole" (sic) "of Petrograd has awakened; it has gone out into the street and has loudly and solemnly proclaimed its confidence in the Provisional Government."

"*The whole*" of Petrograd!— the ministerial paper will have nothing less.... If from the "whole" of Petrograd we subtract all the *workers*, who demonstrated *against* the Provisional Government, if we subtract the vast majority of the soldiers who went out into the street and demonstrated *against* the Provisional Government, if we subtract the hundreds of thousands of people who simply stayed at home, if the "whole" of Petrograd is taken to mean an insignificant minority of the bourgeoisie, a small section of the students, and a section of the senior army officers—then the ministerial paper is right: the "whole" of Petrograd has come out for the Guchkovs and the Milyukovs....

Relying on the "whole" of Petrograd (remember the Potemkin villages![535]), the ministerial newspaper launches directly into pogrom baiting against us.

"...These shots by some armed men, these killings of soldiers, in connection with the unprecedentedly brazen flying of the defeatist flags from the German embassy.... Yesterday's bloody outrages by the Leninists have worn thin everyone's tolerance and have dealt an irreparable blow to this anti-national treasonable propaganda. Let us hope that this propaganda will never again dare to rear its head."

Let the reader judge where the brazenness lies. Every word there is lies and slander. Our comrades did not fly any flags at all from the German embassy. Our comrades are not to blame for the killings of the soldiers. Responsibility for yesterday's acts of violence falls on the Provisional Government and no one else.

Let the reader judge whose propaganda is really treasonable.

Written on April 22 (May 5), 1917

Published on May 6 (April 23), 1917 in *Pravda* No. 39

Printed from the *Pravda* text

THE SEVENTH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)[536]

APRIL 24-29 (MAY 7-12), 1917

1

SPEECH ON THE PLAN TO CONVENE AN INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE[537] APRIL 25 (MAY 8)

1

VARIANT OF MINUTES

I do not agree with the previous speaker.

In Borgbjerg's proposal we have a political fact of exceptional importance which imposes on us the duty of exposing the social-chauvinists and launching a political campaign. The British and French "socialists" have rejected Borgbjerg's proposal. The British and French Plekhanovs are not coming to this conference. Borgbjerg's proposals are a farce. Through Borgbjerg, the German social-chauvinists are offering their terms for peace. They are doing this through a socialist in order to cover up their social-chauvinist intrigue. This must be exposed, to discourage them from ever again applying to the socialist parties.

There can be no doubt at all that this is a proposal coming from the German Government, which is acting through its own social-chauvinists. It is the one that is arranging this congress.... It cannot do so openly, and is therefore doing it through its own Plekhanovs. By this diplomatic step the German Government sheds all responsibility while propounding through them its secret hopes. Let me read you a report in a foreign paper about Borgbjerg: "Through a Danish social-chauvinist, the German Kaiser wants to call a peace conference in his own interests." Borgbjerg's proposal is clearly nothing but a fraud and a swindle. Then we have a report from *Rabochaya Gazeta*.[538] (*Reads out the report from "Rabochaya Gazeta" of April 25, 1917.*) It is beyond doubt, therefore? that this is a proposal from the German Government. That is how such things are done. It is our task to expose the inner workings of this to the

world, i.e., pass a detailed resolution, translate it into several languages and publish it in all the papers. I move a draft resolution.

It is a curious fact that the capitalist newspapers are maintaining a diplomatic silence. They know the rule, that speech is silvern and silence is golden. The bourgeois newspapers know what the whole thing is about. Newspapers like *Rabochaya Gazeta* are at a loss. *Yedinstvo*[539] alone has said that Borgbjerg is an agent of the German Government. But by saying in the next breath that neither the British nor the French social-chauvinists, nor the Russian Plekhanovs will attend this conference under any circumstances, it exposes the British, French and Russian governments, who, being aware of the really difficult condition of Germany, hope to fill their appetites at her expense. We must expose this comedy of masques. We must tell how such things are done: Bethmann-Hollweg goes to Wilhelm, Wilhelm summons Scheidemann, Scheidemann goes to Denmark, and as a result, Borgbjerg goes to Russia with the peace terms. (*Reads out the resolution.*)

Trier is a Danish Marxist. Denmark is a petty-bourgeois country. Her bourgeoisie has battened on the war and hates the workers. The leaders of the Danish Social-Democratic majority are among the most opportunist in Europe. They have clearly exposed themselves as real social-chauvinists. We, for our part, must be fair and say about Borgbjerg what we have said about Plekhanov. If we hear fine phrases shouted to us about Alsace-Lorraine, we must remember that the whole thing boils down to money. In fact, it is a question of unusually rich ores. It is a question of profit, a peaceful sharing out of the booty between the German and the French capitalists. The Danish internationalists have rejected this. I forgot to say that the Kautskyites have agreed to attend the conference, and this must be exposed. The proposal coming via Borgbjerg says that the German capitalists are bargaining, because they are incapable of holding on to what they have seized. Germany's position is desperate, she is on the brink of ruin. But the German capitalists still hope to retain a bit. The diplomatists have strong bonds with each other, they know everything, everything is clear to them. The people alone are not told

such things. The Anglo-French chauvinists have refused to attend the conference because they are very well aware of the real state of affairs. There was good reason for their taking ministerial office. It is now a matter of strangulating and plundering Germany, for she is no longer capable of conducting a policy of aggrandizement. Borgbjerg is an agent of German imperialism. If the soldiers receive this resolution they will understand that it is now a question of squeezing the last breath out of Germany. Congresses are farces attended by social-chauvinist diplomatists. There is the congress, and in the next room they will be sharing out Alsace-Lorraine. The truth about congresses must be told once and for all, to open the people's eyes. If we adopt this manifesto and have it printed, translated into foreign languages and circulated among the workers and soldiers, they will understand the real state of affairs. This will be a very genuine campaign, it will be a clarification of the proletarian line.

First published in 1958 in the book *Sedmaya (Aprelskaya) Vserossiiskaya konferentsia R.S.D.R.P.(B.). Petrogradskaya obshchegorodskaya konferentsia R.S.D.R.P.(B.). Aprel 1917 goda. Protokoly* (The Seventh [April] All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.[B.]. The Petrograd City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.[B.], April 1917. Minutes).

Printed from the text of the book

2

NEWSPAPER REPORT

The invitation to attend the conference is addressed to all the socialist parties of Russia and consequently to our own as well, and so we cannot simply ignore this fact of international importance. The social-chauvinists of all the belligerent countries are acting as unofficial representatives of their governments and ruling classes, Comrade Lenin said.

The German Government, under the pressure of internal discontent, is prepared to give up *some* of its annexations, and Borgbjerg is its diplomatic representative. He (a representative of Stauning's party, from which a group of Marxists, headed by Comrade Trier, withdrew following

Stauning's entry into the bourgeois ministry) has nothing in common either with the German or the Scandinavian workers. A conference of social-patriotic majorities appears to the German ruling circles to be a convenient occasion for trying to come to terms with the brigands on the other side.

The social-patriots, who have taken part in this ignominious war, as Comrade Nogin put it, want to have a hand in its ignominious end as well. On the other hand, the rebuff administered to this proposal by the imperialists of the Triple Entente lays quite bare their schemes of conquest. That is what revolutionary Social-Democracy must use in its own interests, by exposing the fraud on both sides. The Party, which unites more than 70,000 workers, must issue a warning against this fraud to the internationalist workers of all countries.

Pravda No. 41
May 9 (April 26), 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

2

PROPOSAL FOR LINES OF DEBATE ON V. P. NOGIN'S REPORT ON "ATTITUDE TO THE SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES" APRIL 25 (MAY 8)

It is proposed that speakers concentrate on replies to specific questions for working out a general Party platform. Questions: 1) militia, 2) working hours, 3) wages, 4) increase and decrease of production, 5) have there been any removals of management? how and from whom is it organised? 6) single or dual power, 7) elements reducing revolutionary élan, 8) disarmament of the bourgeoisie, 9) food supplies, 10)....*

Additional: 1) are the Soviets being transformed into Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies? 2) their role in connection with the state-wide Soviet.

First published in 1934 in the book *Sedmaya (Aprelskaya) Vserossiiskaya i Petrogradskaya obshchegorodskaya konferentsii R.S.D.R.P.(B.). Aprel 1917 goda*

Printed from a typewritten copy of the minutes

* Hiatus in the minutes.—*Ed.*

3
SPEECH ON THE ATTITUDE TO THE SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES APRIL 25 (MAY 8)

1
MINUTES

The materials submitted by comrades on the activity of the Soviets, while being incomplete, are remarkably interesting. This may be the most important information material produced by the conference, material which makes it possible to verify our slogans against the actual course of life. The picture we now have disposes us to optimistic conclusions. The movement started out in the centres; initially all the energy of the proletariat there was concentrated on the struggle. A mass of energy was spent on the struggle against tsarism. This struggle in Petrograd has eliminated the central state power. A gigantic task has been done. But if that has led to the seizure of power by the bourgeoisie it does not warrant any pessimistic conclusions, it is not right to regard the workers' failure to take power as a mistake. It would be utopian to suppose that after a few days of struggle the masses could have taken power into their hands. That could not have been done in the presence of the bourgeoisie, which was very well prepared for taking over.

From the centre, the revolution is moving into the localities. That is what happened in France—the revolution is becoming a municipal one. The movement in the localities shows that there the majority is for the peasants, for the workers, that there has been the least leadership from the bourgeoisie; that there the masses did not lose their head. The more data we collect, the more they show us that the greater the proletarian section of the population and the fewer the intermediate elements, the better the revolution advances in the localities. The Kazan comrades have gone over directly to the tasks of the socialist revolution. We find that even where the proletariat's organisations are insignificant, the practical requirements have given the proletariat an absolutely correct definition of its tasks. Without such elements as, for instance, statistics, etc., the proletarian

revolution cannot be carried out. For the proletarian revolution to be carried out, it is necessary that the engineers, technicians, etc., should be under the practical control of the revolutionary proletariat. The revolution in the localities has gone forward easily. There is always the danger of anarchy in a revolution. Over here anarchy is not....*

The bourgeois revolution is unmindful of production, but here the workers are giving it thought. The workers are interested in seeing that production does not dwindle. The revolution in the localities is going forward in gigantic strides. Reports from the localities have shown that the sharper the class contradictions, the more correctly the revolution advances, the surer the dictatorship of the proletariat is realised. While the dictatorship of the proletariat is being implemented in the small localities, the centres turn out to be the least suitable for the revolution's advance.

There is absolutely no ground for any pessimism. It is a fact that collaboration with the bourgeoisie is beginning in the centres. Through its better organisation, the bourgeoisie is trying to turn the proletariat into a servitor, to make the workers temporary participants in what the bourgeoisie is building. It is ridiculous to think that the Russian people are drawing their guiding principles from pamphlets. Not at all, it is from the immediate practice that the experience of the masses flows....* The people can work it out by participating in a mass movement. The people themselves have started to accumulate mass experience....* In Penza Gubernia, the power took shape under the dictatorship of the peasantry. The Penza representative showed the resolutions of the peasants who had taken over the implements of production and land. Marx's words are being confirmed....* The programme of the revolution is being carried out in the localities—in order to have grain ...* to establish relations themselves. This revolution produces men of practice. The revolution can go forward only under the control of practical experience in the localities. And we are very greatly encouraged by the course of the revolution throughout the whole of Russia, where the gigantic majority are peasants.

---

* Hiatus in the minutes.—*Ed.*

After there proved to be insufficient strength to take over production in the centre, this is being done in the provinces, where it is easily done. In the provinces, the revolution is a municipal one, and it is giving impetus to the centre; the latter is picking up their experience.

The comrade coal-miner said that their first task when...* was to go for grain.... It is wrong to think that this experience can go to waste. Without this experience, the centres have nowhere to get an impetus from for a fresh revolution. The new revolution is mounting. The course of events, the dislocation of life, the famine—that is what is propelling the revolution. Hence the struggle against the elements supporting the bourgeoisie. Things are moving towards a collapse which the bourgeoisie will not cope with. We are preparing a new multimillion army which could show its mettle in the Soviets, in the Constituent Assembly—just how, we do not as yet know. Over here in the centre we do not have enough strength. There is a tremendous preponderance in the provinces. On our side is the development of the revolution in the localities, which is going forward and overtaking us.

The people are not setting themselves any communist plans. The revolutionary class throughout Russia is mustering its forces, and it is our task to accumulate this experience and take a step as these forces are mustered. We must not allow ourselves to be intimidated by the fact that they (Narodniks, Mensheviks) are in such an overwhelming majority.

On the strength of the experience, we can now state in the resolution....* In the localities, the production has to be taken over, otherwise the collapse is inevitable. The peasants will not give the grain. To obtain the grain, the measures must be revolutionary, which can be put through by the revolutionary class, relying on the masses in their millions.

I asked comrades from the localities about the state of production there.

The 8-hour day has been introduced in Nizhny Novgorod

---

* Hiatus in the minutes.—*Ed.*

Gubernia, and production has increased. That is the earnest. There is no other way of escaping the ruin. It will take a vast amount of work. We are separating ourselves from the petty-bourgeois line. Life is on our side. The crisis cannot be resolved by petty-bourgeois-democratic methods, because they stop short of revolutionary measures (Shingaryov, Milyukov). The general course of the revolution shows that things are moving forward.

We do not differ from the petty bourgeoisie in that it says "caution", and we say "speed"; we say "even more caution". There must be a relentless struggle against this state game....* Better later than earlier—and the centre will win out. (*Applause.*)

First published in 1934 in the book *Sedmaya (Aprelskaya) Vserossiiskaya i Petrogradskaya obshchegorodskaya konferentsii R.S.D.R.P.(B.). Aprel 1917 goda*

Printed from a typewritten copy of the minutes

2

NEWSPAPER REPORT

Comrade Lenin pointed out that the French revolution passed through a phase of municipal revolution, that it drew its strength from the local organs of self-government, which became its mainstay. In the Russian revolution we observe a certain bureaucracy in the centres, and a greater exercise of power wielded by the Soviets locally, in the provinces. In the capital cities the Soviets are politically more dependent on the bourgeois central authorities than those in the provinces. In the centres it is not so easy to take control of production, in the provinces this has already been carried out to some extent. The inference is: to strengthen the local Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. Progress in this respect is possible, coming primarily from the provinces.

Pravda No. 42
May 10 (April 27), 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

* Hiatus in the minutes.—*Ed.*

4
SPEECH IN DEFENCE OF THE RESOLUTION ON THE WAR
APRIL 27 (MAY 10)

NEWSPAPER REPORT

Comrade Lenin, speaking in substantiation of the first resolution, pointed out the need for dividing the resolution into three parts: first, giving a class analysis of the war; second, dealing with so-called "revolutionary defencism", and third, answering the question of how to end the war. The first part of the resolution exposes the mainsprings of the imperialist war, establishes their connection with a definite period in the development of capitalism and brings out the annexationist strivings of the ruling classes of all countries. The second part gives a characteristic of the peculiar trend. The third part outlines the way to end the war—the way of revolutionary class struggle for power—refuting the absurd slander about a "separate" peace.

Pravda No. 44
May 12 (April 29), 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

5
REMARKS IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE WAR
APRIL 27 (MAY 10)

1

Gelman motions that the words "Menshevik opportunist Social-Democratic Party" should be replaced by the words "the Party's opportunist wing", arguing that not all the Mensheviks belong to the defencist trend, and that the Left wing does not share the defencist standpoint.

Lenin opposes the amendment: we are speaking about the majority, about the Menshevik Party as a whole, which is why the characteristic should not be changed.

2

Vedernikov proposes that the names "Chkheidze, Tsereteli and others" should be struck out.... If we delete them the resolution will not lose in any way.

Ovsyanikov ... proposes that the words "Chkheidze, Tsereteli, the O.C." should be deleted.

Lenin comes out against both amendments. One of two things—either the names or the O.C.—unless both are retained. The first comrade proposes to leave the O.C. in and throw out the names. But is the Organising Committee sufficiently well known to the masses, or must the well-known names of Tsereteli and Chkheidze be used to clarify the state of affairs for the masses?

3

Sokolnikov proposes the deletion of the word "completely" in the phrase: "Steps designed to make them completely harmless politically", because only by undermining their economic domination can the capitalists be rendered politically harmless....

Lenin speaks out against the deletion of the word "completely" and proposes the wording: "Steps undermining the economic domination of the capitalists, and steps designed to make them completely...."

First published in 1925 in the book *Petrogradskaya obshchegorodskaya i Vserossiiskaya konferentsii R.S.D.R.P.(B.). v aprele 1917 goda*

Printed from a typewritten copy of the minutes

6

PRELIMINARY DRAFT ALTERATIONS IN THE R.S.D.L.P. PARTY PROGRAMME[540]

At the end of the preamble (after the words "the standpoint of the proletariat") insert:

World capitalism has at the present time, i.e., since about the beginning of the twentieth century, reached the stage of imperialism. Imperialism, or the epoch of finance capital, is a high stage of development of the capitalist economic system, one in which monopolist associations of capitalists—syndicates, cartels and trusts—have assumed decisive importance: in which enormously concentrated banking capital has fused with industrial capital; in which the export of capital to foreign countries has assumed vast proportions: in which the whole world has been divided up

territorially among the richer countries, and the economic carve-up of the world among international trusts has begun.

Imperialist wars, i.e., wars for world domination, for markets for banking capital and for the subjugation of small and weaker nations, are inevitable under such a state of affairs. The first great imperialist war, the war of 1914-17, is precisely such a war.

The extremely high level of development which world capitalism in general has attained, the replacement of free competition by monopoly capitalism, the fact that the banks and the capitalist associations have prepared the machinery for the social regulation of the process of production and distribution of products, the horrors, misery, ruin, and brutalisation caused by the imperialist war—all these factors transform the present stage of capitalist development into an era of proletarian socialist revolution.

That era has dawned.

Only a proletarian socialist revolution can lead humanity out of the impasse which imperialism and imperialist wars have created. Whatever difficulties the revolution may have to encounter, whatever possible temporary setbacks or waves of counter-revolution it may have to contend with, the final victory of the proletariat is inevitable.

Objective conditions make it the urgent task of the day to prepare the proletariat in every way for the revolution and resolutely break with the bourgeois perversion of socialism, which has taken the upper hand in the official Social-Democratic parties in the form of a social-chauvinist trend (that is, socialism in words, chauvinism in fact, or the use of the "defend your country" slogan to cover up defence of capitalist interests in imperialist wars), and also in the form of a Centre trend (i.e., unprincipled, helpless vacillation between social-chauvinism and revolutionary internationalist-proletarian struggle)* for the conquest of political power in order to carry out the economic and political measures which are the sum and substance of the socialist revolution.

* *
*

* The text from "for the revolution..." to "proletarian struggle)" is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

The fulfilment of this task, which calls for the fullest trust, the closest fraternal ties, and direct unity of revolutionary action on the part of the working class in all the advanced countries, is impossible without an immediate break in principle with the bourgeois perversion of socialism, which has gained the upper hand among the leadership of the great majority of the official Social-Democratic parties. Such a perversion is, on the one hand, the social-chauvinist trend, socialism in word and chauvinism in deed, the defence of the predatory interests of "one's own" national bourgeoisie under the guise of "defence of one's country"; and, on the other hand, the equally wide international trend of the so-called Centre, which stands for unity with the social-chauvinists and for the preservation or correction of the bankrupt Second International, and which vacillates between social-chauvinism and the internationalist revolutionary struggle of the proletariat for the achievement of a socialist system.

* *
*

The experience of the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917, which created the Soviets of Workers' Deputies and a number of similar organisations, thereby confirmed the experience of the Paris Commune, which consisted in the fact that the proletariat must have a state for the period of transition to socialism, but this state* must not be a conventional type of state, but the immediate, massive and wholesale organisation of the armed workers to substitute for the old instruments of administration: the standing army, the police and the civil service. Explanation to the proletariat of the tasks of such a state—capable both of consolidating the gains of the revolution in general and of ensuring the most peaceful and balanced transition to socialism—

---

* The text from "The experience of the Russian revolutions..." to "but this state" is crossed out in the MS. The end of the paragraph was left standing inadvertently; it was written on a separate sheet, at the bottom of which there is a note in an unknown hand: "Add: Apparatus for the regulation of production is ready in the form of trusts and concentration of banks" (see Lenin's insertion in the "Proposed Amendments to the Doctrinal, Political and Other Sections of the Programme", present edition, Vol. 24, p. 459).—*Ed.*

must constitute one of the principal tasks of the proletarian party alongside its struggle against the representatives of the bankrupt Second (1889-1914) International, who have distorted Marxism and betrayed socialism on the dictatorship of the proletariat question.

Monopoly capitalism, which has been developing into state-monopoly capitalism in a number of advanced countries with especial rapidity during the war, means gigantic socialisation of production and, consequently, complete preparation of the objective conditions for the establishment of a socialist society.*

* *
*

In the minimum programme, the whole beginning (from the words "On the path" down to §1) should be crossed out, and replaced by the following:

In Russia at the present moment, when the Provisional Government, which is part and parcel of the landowner and capitalist class and enjoys the confidence—necessarily unstable—of the broad mass of the petty-bourgeois population, has undertaken to convene a Constituent Assembly, the immediate duty of the party of the proletariat is to fight for a political system which will best guarantee economic progress and the rights of the people in general, and make possible the least painful transition to socialism in particular.

The party is fighting and helping the masses to wage an immediate struggle for a democratic republic, starting the implementation of the freedoms by the masses' organisation on their own, from below, and working for the establishment not of a bourgeois parliamentary republic, with its special guarantees both for the domination of the capitalists and for the possibility of using force against the masses through the retention of the old organs of mass oppression: the police, the standing army and the civil service, but of a more democratic proletarian-peasant republic in which the retention of these organs of oppression is impossible and inadmissible, and where the state power belongs directly to the workers and peasants who are armed to a man.

* The text from "Monopoly Capitalism..." to "socialist society" is crossed out in the MS.—*Ed.*

§1. Supreme power in the state must be vested entirely in the people's representatives, who shall be elected by the people and be subject to recall at any time, and who shall constitute a single popular assembly, a single chamber.

§2. Add:

Proportional representation at all elections; all delegates and elected officials, without exception, to be subject to recall at any time upon the decision of a majority of their electors.

§3. Add:

No supervision or control from above over the decisions and acts of regional and local self-governments.

§9 to read:

The right of all member nations of the state to freely secede and form independent states. The republic of the Russian nation must attract other nations or nationalities not by force, but exclusively by voluntary agreement on the question of forming a common state. The unity and fraternal alliance of the workers of all countries are incompatible with the use of force, direct or indirect, against other nationalities.

§11 to read:

Judges and all other officials, both civil and military, to be elected by the people with the right to recall any of them at any time by decision of a majority of their electors. Salaries to all officials to be not above the wages of a skilled worker, 300-500 rubles, depending on the number of family members and their earnings; unconditional prohibition for officials to supplement their salaries with income from other sources.

§12 to read:

The police and standing army to be replaced by the universally armed people; workers and other employees to receive regular wages from the capitalists for the time devoted to public service in the people's militia.

* *
*

§14 of the political section, §5 and others of the economic section should be, *like the whole of the economic section*, specially re-examined by commissions consisting of trade union workers and teachers.

After the fiscal clause of the programme (following the words "on incomes and inheritances") insert:

The high level of development of capitalism already achieved in banking and in the trustified branches of industry, on the one hand, and the economic disruption caused by the imperialist war, everywhere evoking a demand for state and public control of the production and distribution of all staple products, on the other, induce the party to demand the nationalisation of the banks, syndicates (trusts), etc.

* *
*

The agrarian programme should be replaced by an agrarian resolution (see its text separately)* or rewritten in accordance with it.**

* *
*

The concluding part of the programme (the last two paragraphs from the words: "In the endeavour to achieve") to be entirely deleted.

FOR THE PROGRAMME
BETTER VARIANT***

The party of the proletariat cannot rest content with a bourgeois parliamentary democratic republic, which throughout the world preserves and strives to perpetuate the monarchist instruments for the oppression of the masses, namely, the police, the standing army, and the privileged bureaucracy.

The party fights for a more democratic workers' and peasants' republic, in which the police and the standing army will be abolished and replaced by the universally armed people, by a people's militia; all officials will be not only elective, but also subject to recall at any time upon the

* See "Resolution on the Agrarian Question", present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 290-93).—*Ed.*

** See "Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme", ibid., p. 463.—*Ed.*

*** This variant is included in the "Proposed Amendments to the Doctrinal, Political and Other Sections of the Programme" (see present edition, Vol. 24, p. 461).—*Ed.*

demand of a majority of the electors; all officials, without exception, will be paid at a rate not exceeding the average wage of a competent worker; parliamentary representative institutions will be gradually replaced by Soviets of people's representatives (from various classes and professions, or from various localities), functioning as both legislative and executive bodies.

Written not later than April 28 (May 11), 1917
First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXI*
Printed from the original

7

REPORT ON THE QUESTION REVISING THE PARTY PROGRAMME APRIL 28 (MAY 11)

NEWSPAPER REPORT

The commission has proposed the adoption of a resolution on the *direction* in which the Party programme should be changed: 1) evaluation of imperialism in connection with the approaching social revolution; 2) amending the paragraphs on the state—the state without a standing army, a police, or a privileged bureaucracy; 3) elimination of what is out of date in the political programme (about tsarism, etc.); 4) altering the minimum programme; 5) rewriting the economic section of the programme, which is obviously out of date, and the school section of the programme; 6-7) inserting demands flowing from the changing structure of capitalist society (nationalisation of the syndicated branches of industry, etc.); 8) adding an analysis of the trends in socialism.

Pravda No. 45
May 13 (April 30), 1917
Printed from the *Pravda* text

8

REPORT ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION APRIL 28 (MAY 11)

NEWSPAPER REPORT

Comrade Lenin pointed to the landed estates, and the incredible jumble of arable fields brought about by the haphazard administration on the peasant land, first of the

bailiffs, then of the 1861 magistrates and finally of the Stolypin officials,[541] as the principal cause of the enslaving feudal relations remaining in the countryside.

Hence, the natural desire on the part of the peasants to "clear the land", to have *all* the land re-allotted, a desire which is expressed in the saying that "all the land is God's". The peasant-holder cannot be reconciled with the obstacles which, in the new conditions of capitalist trade, he finds intolerable. That is proved by the bill submitted by the 104 peasant deputies in the First and Second Dumas.[542]

The Socialist-Revolutionaries have themselves admitted that in that Bill the "petty-economy ideology" prevails over the "principles of equalisation". The peasant wants to own his land, but wants it allotted in accordance with the new demands of the commodity economy. Even where some peasants appear to accept the principle of egalitarian land tenure, their view of it is different from that of the S.R. intellectuals. The statistical result of the distribution of the landowner and peasant holdings in Russia comes to the following figures: 300 peasant families hold 2,000 dessiatines, and *one* landowner holds *as much*. Their demand for "equalisation" clearly contains the idea of equalising the rights of the 300 and the one.

The necessity of land nationalisation, as a fully bourgeois and highly progressive measure, has been prepared by the preceding development of the land economy in Russia and the development of the world market. The war has sharpened every contradiction. Just now, the immediate transfer of the land to the peasants is a demand powerfully dictated by the needs of wartime. Shingaryov & Co. actually intensify the crisis by inviting the peasants to *wait* for a Constituent Assembly (whereas the sowing must be done *right away*), thereby threatening to turn the grain shortage into a real famine. They are trying to force on the peasants a bourgeois-bureaucratic solution of the agrarian question. Meanwhile, there is no time to wait for the legalisation of landownership, because the crisis is approaching in gigantic strides. The peasants have already displayed a revolutionary initiative—in Penza Gubernia they have been taking over the landowners' live and dead stock for common use. It goes without saying that our

Party stands only for the *organised* take-over of lands and implements because that is necessary for *increasing* production, while any damage to implements inflicts harm above all on the peasants and workers themselves.

On the other hand, we stand for the separate organisation of agricultural workers.

Pravda No. 45
May 13 (April 30), 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

9

REMARK IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION APRIL 28 (MAY 11)

Solovyov believes that the most essential should be stated at the head of the resolution: that the Party demands the nationalisation of the land.

This amendment is not very essential. I put nationalisation in third place, because initiative and revolutionary action must come first, while nationalisation is a law expressing the people's will. I motion against.

First published in 1925 in the book *Petrogradskaya obshchegorodskaya i Vserossiiskaya konferentsii R.S.D.R.P.(B.). v aprele 1917 goda*

Printed from a typewritten copy of the minutes

10

SPEECH ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION APRIL 29 (MAY 12)

NEWSPAPER REPORT

Comrade Lenin recalled that the Polish Social-Democrats were against the right to national self-determination in 1903, when the question was not raised in the prospect of a socialist revolution. The specific character of their stand on the national question is due to their peculiar position in Poland; the tsarist oppression fed the nationalistic passions of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois sections of Poland. The Polish Social-Democrats had to go through a desperate struggle against the "socialists" (P.P.S) who were even prepared to have a European war for the sake of Poland's liberation, and only they, the Polish Social-Democrats,

spreading the feelings of international solidarity among the Polish workers, led them closer to the workers of Russia. However, their attempt to impose a rejection of the right to self-determination on the socialists of the *oppressor* nations is extremely erroneous and in the event of success could result in nothing more than the adoption of a chauvinistic stand by the Russian Social-Democrats. By rejecting the oppressed nations' right to self-determination, the socialists of the oppressor nations become chauvinists, giving support to their own bourgeoisie. Russian socialists must work to secure *freedom to secede* for the oppressed nations, while the socialists of the oppressed nations must maintain freedom to integrate, both taking formally different (essentially the same) ways towards the same goal: the international organisation of the proletariat. Those who say that the national question has been solved within the bourgeois system tend to forget that it has been solved (but not in every case) only in the west of Europe, where the purity of the population is sometimes as high as 90 per cent, but not in the east, where the purity of the population is limited to only 43 per cent. Finland's example shows that the national question is in practice on the order of the day and that the alternative is support for the imperialist bourgeoisie or the duty of international solidarity, which does not allow of any violation of the will of the oppressed nations. The Mensheviks, who invited the Finnish Social-Democrats to "wait" until the Constituent Assembly and settle the question of autonomy *together* with it, actually spoke out in the spirit of the Russian imperialists.

Pravda No. 46
May 15 (2), 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

11
SPEECH ON THE SITUATION WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL AND THE TASKS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)
APRIL 29 (MAY 12)

NEWSPAPER REPORT

Comrade Lenin motioned the proposal for a declaration that the R.S.D.L.P. remained within the Zimmerwald bloc only for the purpose of information, and is, consequently,

withdrawing from it. Experience has shown, he said, that it is useless to remain in the bloc. In many countries, Zimmerwald has even become a drag on the forward movement. The social-chauvinists are using it as a cover.

Pravda No. 46
May 15 (2), 1917

Printed from the
Pravda text

12

REMARKS IN THE DEBATE ON THE RESOLUTION ON THE CURRENT SITUATION APRIL 29 (MAY 12)

1

Question from the floor. Does control over the syndicates and banks imply measures recommended only on a state-wide scale or are such measures as control over private enterprises, etc., also included?

No, that is not here, because this living practice has been given expression in another resolution where it is in a better perspective.* This particular resolution deals with another subject—the steps to be taken towards socialism.

2

Solovyov motions an amendment: a few words about the characteristic of the state in this transition period—that is very essential, because it determines the overall direction of the activities of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies....

Lenin objects to Comrade Solovyov's amendment:

In some resolutions we keep coming up against concrete definitions. The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies can operate without the police, because they have their armed soldiers. The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies are institutions which can substitute for the old civil service.

The old agrarian programme ...** has not been realised, but we should say: "The Party demands a peasant-proletari-

---

* See present edition, Vol. 24, p. 295.—*Ed.*
** One word is illegible in the minutes.—*Ed.*

an republic without a police, a standing army or a civil service." Consequently, the conference has predetermined this issue,* so all we have to do now is to formulate.

First published in 1925 in the book *Petrogradskaya obshchegorodskaya i Vserossiiskaya konferentsii R.S.D.R.P.(B.). v aprele 1917 goda*

Printed from a typewritten copy of the minutes

OUTLINE OF UNIDENTIFIED SPEECH AT A MEETING

The revolution has been carried out by the Petrograd workers.

The revolution has not stopped, it is just starting.

Petrograd has awakened Russia. Petrograd has liberated her. The great cause of the Petrograd workers.

The Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies will subsequently take power and do away with war and the rule of capital!

What the Petrograd workers have started, the soldiers' fraternisation at the front will continue.

Fraternal alliance of workers of all countries.

Revolutionary alliance.

Long live the Russian revolution!

Long live the world socialist revolution!

N. Lenin

April 25, 1917**

First published in 1933 in *Lenin Miscellany XXI*

Printed from notes in an unknown hand, revised and enlarged by Lenin

TOO GROSS A LIE

The sage *Rabochaya Gazeta* has assured its readers that Plekhanov and Lenin are allies because both oppose the Stockholm conference of the social-chauvinists. *Rabochaya Gazeta* confines itself to issuing a few shouts, saying not a word about our arguments in substance, and keeping

* See present edition, Vol. 24, p. 280.—*Ed.*

** The last two sentences, the date and the signature are in Lenin's hand.—*Ed.*

silent about the fact that this conference is a *screen* for capitalist diplomats!

This is a cheap trick!

Marxists must tell the people the truth and expose the tricks of the diplomats operating *through* the social-chauvinists.

No Marxist will allow himself, as *Rabochaya Gazeta* does, to keep silent about the fact that the refusal of the French social-chauvinists *means* a desire on the part of the Anglo-French and Russian bourgeoisie to drag out the war until Germany's total defeat.

Pravda No. 43
May 11 (April 28), 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

AN UNFINISHED AUTOBIOGRAPHY[543]

Comrades! The Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has transmitted to me your letter of April 24, 1917. In it you ask about my origin, where I had been, whether I had been exiled and what for. In what manner I returned to Russia and what is my activity at the present time, i.e., whether it (this activity) is doing you good or harm.

I reply to all these questions, except the last one, because it is for you to judge whether or not my activity is doing you any good.

My name is Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov.

I was born in Simbirsk on April 10, 1870. In the spring of 1887, my elder brother Alexander was executed by Alexander III for an attempt on his life (March 1, 1887). In December 1887, I was arrested for the first time and expelled from Kazan University for students' disturbances; I was then banished from Kazan.

In December 1895, I was arrested for the second time for Social-Democratic propaganda among the workers of St. Petersburg....*

Written not earlier than May 4 (17), 1917

First published on April 16, 1927 in *Pravda* No. 86

Printed from the original

* Here the MS. breaks off.—*Ed.*

REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE SEVENTH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.) AT A MEETING OF THE PETROGRAD ORGANISATION MAY 8 (21), 1917[544]

Comrade Lenin begins by saying that the conference met at an extraordinary time: there is now a revolution in Russia and an unprecedented war all over the world.

Consequently, if we are to understand the decisions of our conference we must first of all understand the kind of war we are waging and who began it, what kind of revolution we have carried out and the kind of revolution that lies ahead of us.

The war was not started by the workers and peasants: neither the Russian, the German, the French, the Italian, the Belgian, nor the British workers and peasants started this war. The war was started and is being continued by the capitalists of the world: the British capitalists and their friends, the French, the Russian and the Italian capitalists, against the German capitalists and their friends, the Austrian capitalists.

What is this war being fought for?

Is it being fought for the emancipation or for the interests of the workers and peasants? No, it is not.

The purpose of the war is plunder and a division of foreign lands—that is what makes the capitalists shout about the war to a victorious end.

Tsar Nicholas, as big a brigand as Wilhelm, concluded secret predatory treaties with the British and French capitalists; these treaties are not being published as otherwise the whole people would realise the fraud, and the war would quickly be over. That is why our resolution on the war flatly calls this war a predatory *imperialist* war.

How, then, can an end be put to this world-wide slaughter? Can it be ended by someone pulling out of it?

No, it cannot. It cannot because the war is being fought not by two states but by many, and because the capitalists can end the war only for a time in order to prepare for a new one. That is the kind of peace no worker or peasant wants,

whoever he may be, a German, a Frenchman or a Russian.

Who, then, can end the war?

The war can be ended only by the workers and peasants, not of Russia alone, but of the whole world. The workers and peasants of the world have the same interests: struggle against the capitalists and the landowners. That is why, only by uniting, the workers and peasants of the world can put an end to this war. That is why we Bolsheviks are against a separate peace, i.e., against a peace only between Russia and Germany. A separate peace is a stupidity, because it fails to settle the basic issue, the struggle against the capitalists and the landowners.

How, then, are the workers and peasants of the whole world to unite? The war is in their way.

The Russian revolution has toppled the autocracy and has given the Russian people unprecedented freedom, which is unmatched among any people of the world. But has it settled the basic question of Russian life, the question of land? No, because the land is still in the hands of the landowners. Why is that so? Because the people who overthrew the tsar handed over power not only into the hands of their elected representatives—peasants and workers, the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, but also into the hands of the Provisional Government.

The Provisional Government, let us note, consists of capitalists, landowners and those who sincerely or hypocritically say that Russia can be saved only hand in hand with the landowners.

But the landowners refuse to give land to the peasants, the capitalists refuse to give up their profits from the war and the plunder of foreign lands.

That is why we Bolsheviks do not support the Provisional Government, and do not advise socialists to take ministerial office.

Socialist ministers can do no more than lend their names to cover up plunder and conquest. And they are already doing so. They have entered the government and have joined the capitalists in saying: this war is not only a defensive, but also an offensive one, and the peasants will not get their land now, but after the convocation of the Constituent Assembly.

That is why we are against the Provisional Government and recognise only *our own* government: the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. There is no better government, the people have not yet created one, and you can't invent one.

Why, in that case, has this government of ours decided to give support to the Provisional Government consisting of capitalists, landowners and socialists, who do not want to give land to the people now and preach an offensive? Because we now have in the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies a majority of peasant-soldiers who do not understand what each of the parties wants *in practice*.

Hence, our task is patiently to explain to the workers and peasants that everything—the end of the war, land for the peasants, and real struggle against the capitalists, not in words, but in deeds—will be secured only when the whole people comes to realise not from books, but from its own experience that only full power for the workers and peasants, only the power of the Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies can help to start a resolute struggle for peace, for land and for socialism.

You cannot disregard the people. Only dreamers and plotters believed that a minority could impose their will on a majority. That was what the French revolutionary Blanqui thought, and he was wrong. When the majority of the people refuse, because they do not yet understand, to take power into their own hands, the minority, however revolutionary and clever, cannot impose their desire on the majority of the people.

From this flow our actions.

We Bolsheviks must patiently and perseveringly explain our views to the workers and peasants. Each of us must forget our old view of our work, each, without waiting for the arrival of an agitator, a propagandist, a more knowledgeable comrade who will explain everything—each of us must become all in one: agitator, propagandist and Party organiser.

That is the only way we can get the people to understand our doctrine, to think over their experience and really take power into their own hands.

First published in 1927
in *Zapiski Instituta Lenina*
(Transactions of the Lenin
Institute), Vol. I

Printed from the
Zapiski text

PLAN OF RESOLUTION ON ECONOMIC MEASURES FOR COMBATING THE DISLOCATION

1. A collapse is imminent.
2. Neither a bureaucratic nor a bourgeois *solution* is possible.
3. Workers' control must be, first, really *working-class* (three-quarters of the *votes* of workers).
4. " " " " developed into *regulation*.
5. " " " " extended to all financial operations and the financial side of the business in general.
6. Salvation from the collapse unquestionably demands that the revolutionary measures should be *started* with the **expropriation** of the biggest and big capital.
7. This is to be continued by revolutionary measures: the organisation of **universal labour service** *through the workers' militia* ... (free workers' service in the militia over and above their 8 hours of work).
8. Switch of manpower to the production of coal and raw materials and to transport....

\+ 6 *bis* Organisation of exchange of grain for implements, footwear, clothes....

\+ *9*. Switch of manpower from bombs to useful products.

\+ **Economy of resources....**

\+ Universal labour service must yield the utmost and the strictest economy of resources and manpower.

Written before May 25 (June 7), 1917

First published in 1925 in *Lenin Miscellany IV*

Printed from the original

INSERTION FOR N. K. KRUPSKAYA'S ARTICLE "A PAGE FROM THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY"[545]

On Tuesday, May 9, more than 200 émigrés, travelling across Germany, arrived from Switzerland. Among them were the Menshevik leader Martov, the Socialist-Revolutionary leader Natanson and others. This transit has provided fresh evidence that there is no other reliable way from Switzerland, except via Germany. *Izvestia Petrogradskogo Sovieta Rabochikh i Soldatskikh Deputatov* (No. 32 of April 5) carries a report by Lenin and Zinoviev about their trip across Germany, giving the names of the socialists of two neutral countries (Switzerland and Sweden) who certified by their signatures that the trip across Germany was undertaken of necessity and that it did not involve relations with the German Government which were in any way reprehensible.

Soldatskaya Pravda No. 21
May 26 (13), 1917

Printed from the original

STATEMENT OF FACT CONCERNING THE COMMISSION OF THE NEWSPAPER *VPERYOD* AT A MEETING OF THE ST. PETERSBURG R.S.D.L.P.(B.) COMMITTEE MAY 30 (JUNE 12), 1917

Concerning Comrade Tomsky's reference to the 1906 workers press commission and its complete failure, I state that this reference is factually incorrect and that the commission of the newspaper *Vperyod*[546] (headed by A. A. Bogdanov and others) was undoubtedly useful.

First published in 1927 in the book *Pervy legalny Peterburgsky komitet bolshevikov v 1917 godu* (First Legal Petersburg Committee of Bolsheviks in 1917)

Printed from a typewritten copy of the minutes

SPEECH AT A SITTING OF THE BOLSHEVIK GROUP OF THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES MAY 31 (JUNE 13), 1917

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

On behalf of the Central Committee, Lenin greets all internationalist Social-Democrats without distinction of group affiliation.

The speaker goes on to the question of how the European war can be eliminated. It then turns out that he does not see the settlement of the European crisis in such optimistic colours as A. Lunacharsky.[547] He says that the "without annexations" formula does not at all mean any desire to return Europe to the "status quo ante". We believe that "without annexations" also means without the seizures carried out before the war. We take this formula to mean giving the peoples complete freedom to secede from one state and join another. But it is impossible to implement this formula without a socialist revolution, which is why there is no way out of the European war except a world-wide revolution.

Referring to fraternisation, Lenin says: the spontaneous fraternisation will not settle the question of peace, but we regard it as the cornerstone of our revolutionary work. Fraternisation does not in itself solve the question, but then no other measure alone decides the revolution until it leads to one. What is a strike or a demonstration? They are after all only a link in the entire chain of the revolutionary struggle. We are being told that this fraternisation has worsened the situation on the other fronts. That is not true. It has created a virtual armistice on our front and has caused small changes on the Western front. But in whose favour? In favour of Britain and France. On the other hand, Britain has scored a great success in Asia: she has gobbled up Baghdad. The suspension of the fighting on our front has been brought about by revolutionary fraternisation, against which Kerensky is waging a war, and against which an offensive signed by the Mensheviks has been announced.

We must make fraternisation conscious, we must see that it is transformed into an exchange of ideas, that it is carried over to the other fronts, that it kindles a revolution on the other side of the trenches.

On the question of regulating industry, the speaker says: since February 28, the government has done nothing to cut down the industrialists' profits. The other day we read about the establishment of a commission consisting of several ministers led by Skobelev to work out control measures. But we had commissions under the tsar, they are nothing but a swindle. The speaker says there is need immediately to take over the landed estates, and ends his speech by stating that the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies must either take all the power or die an inglorious death.

Notes are being passed to the speaker from every side. Within a short time they number 20. The first of them asks whether the draft reinforcements should be sent to the front. Replying to the question, Lenin says: under the tsarist power we had to go into the army and work there. Liebknecht put on a uniform to conduct agitation against the war. It is naive to think that the war can be abolished by separate anarchic action.

Novaya Zhizn No. 37,
June 1 (14), 1917

Printed from the
Novaya Zhizn text

DRAFT RESOLUTION FOR A CONFERENCE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF DISTRICT COMMITTEES AND ARMY UNITS OF PETROGRAD TOGETHER WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE C.C. AND THE P.C. JUNE 10 (23), 1917

Having studied the resolutions of the Congress of Soviets and other organisations, carried today in *Izvestia Petrogradskogo Sovieta*, and also the C.C. resolution published in *Pravda*, concerning the observance of the ban on demonstrations for three days—

— having studied these resolutions and discussed the state of affairs,

resolves:

In view of the fact that the Congress of Soviets and the Executive Committee of the All-Russia Soviet of Peasants' Deputies have made their straightforward statement in their appeal:

"We know that concealed forces of the counter-revolution want to take advantage of your demonstration"

— in view of this it is necessary to admit that we have imagined the counter-revolution to be much weaker, for we have no knowledge as yet of what the Congress of Soviets knows;

— that, consequently, the struggle against the counter-revolution is an even more urgent item on the order of the day;

— that the C.C. resolution on abiding by the direct ban on demonstrations for three days is correct;

— that it is necessary....*

Written on June 10 (23), 1917
First published in 1959 in *Lenin Miscellany XXXVI*

Printed from the original

ON THE GRIMM AFFAIR

We are being asked in what sense we saw Grimm's behaviour as being "ambiguous". We reply—for readers who have not had the opportunity of securing the issue of the newspaper *Volya Naroda*,[548] which was precisely indicated—that the protocol we signed (we would have willingly reprinted it, but for the lack of space in *Pravda*) speaks *only* of Grimm's attitude to *Hoffmann*, the bourgeois minister of *the same* neutral country (Switzerland).

Pravda No. 75
June 20 (7), 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

* Here the MS. breaks off.—*Ed.*

SHAME!

Here is what Mr. Stan. Volsky, a leader writer of *Novaya Zhizn*,[549] has talked himself into today:

"...While denying the right of the big nations to enslave the small nationalities, socialism has never recommended the opposite course of action: enslavement of the big nations by the small nationalities. But it is precisely to this kind of violence against the will of the all-Russia democracy, to a denial of joint revolutionary democratic work, a substitution of national hostility for the class struggle, that the programme, or at any rate the tactics, of the Ukrainian Rada boils down...."

There you see where the swings of the Novaya Zhizn petty-bourgeois chatterboxes are taking them—straight to the Black-Hundred reaction! It is after all only the Menshikovs yesterday and the Katkovs the day before yesterday who could say that the Ukrainians' desire to have their own sejm, their own ministers, their own army, their own finances and other things was "enslavement" of the Russian people!

A foul Great-Russian chauvinism, touched up with sweet quasi-Marxist words, such is the sermon of Minister V. Chernov, Mr. Volsky and *Rabochaya Gazeta*.

Pravda No. 83
June 29 (16), 1917

Printed from the *Pravda* text

REPORT ON THE CURRENT SITUATION AT THE ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF FRONT AND REAR MILITARY ORGANISATIONS OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.) JUNE 20 (JULY 3), 1917[550]

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

At the morning sitting, Lenin gave a report on the current situation. He noted the difference between the situation today and that during the Party's April Conference. At that time, the stand of the various socialist parties had still hardly crystallised. Only now, in the present conditions, and in the light of the events that have just taken place, has the real political face of the Mensheviks and the S.R.s been revealed. But the petty bourgeoisie, without being

socialist, may turn out to be really democratically minded. Viewing the S.R. and Menshevik masses from that standpoint, we must give them credit for consistent democratism. But that cannot be said of their leaders, which is why we find that there is a yawning gulf between the S.R. and the Menshevik masses, on the one hand, and their leaders, on the other. The leaders of these masses have been gradually shedding not only their socialism, but their democratism as well. This will be seen in the attitude of the socialist ministers to the three vital issues of the moment.

On the question of land, the socialist section of the government has clearly diverged from the views of the peasantry, and is helping the landowners to keep their lands at their disposal. The second touchstone of the socialist ministers' democratism is their attitude to local self-government. It is an elementary democratic proposition that the local power must be elected by the people themselves, but on this point there have been numerous conflicts between the Provisional Government and the local organs of self-government, and the socialist section of the ministry has been an active fighter against these truly democratic principles. Finally, the third question is the offensive. The socialist Kerensky has managed to secure what the patent imperialist Guchkov had been unable to do.

We revolutionary Social-Democrats must direct our activity towards raising the class consciousness of the democratic masses. That is why we must relentlessly expose these former leaders of petty-bourgeois democracy, pointing out to democracy the only way along which the revolutionary proletariat will march ahead of it.

Novaya Zhizn No. 54,
June 21 (July 4), 1917

Printed from the
Novaya Zhizn text

THE POLITICAL SITUATION[551]

(FOUR THESES)

1. The counter-revolution has become organised and consolidated, and has actually taken state power into its hands.[552]

The complete organisation and consolidation of the counter-revolution consists in a combination of its three

main forces, a combination excellently conceived and already put into practice: (1) The Constitutional-Democratic Party, i.e., the real leader of the organised bourgeoisie, has, by withdrawing from the Cabinet, confronted it with an ultimatum, thus clearing the way for the Cabinet's overthrow by the counter-revolution; (2) The General Staff and the military leaders, with the deliberate or semi-deliberate assistance of Kerensky, whom even the most prominent Socialist-Revolutionaries now call a Cavaignac, have seized actual state power and have proceeded to shoot down revolutionary units at the front, disarm the revolutionary troops and workers in Petrograd and Moscow, suppress unrest in Nizhny Novgorod, arrest Bolsheviks and ban their papers, not only without trial, but even without a government order. At present, basic state power in Russia is virtually a military dictatorship. This fact is still obscured by a number of institutions that are revolutionary in words but powerless in deeds. Yet it is so obvious and fundamental a fact that, without understanding it, one cannot understand anything about the political situation. (3) The Black-Hundred-monarchist and bourgeois press, which has switched from hounding Bolsheviks to hounding the Soviets, the "incendiary" Chernov, etc., has indicated with the utmost clarity that the true meaning of the policy of military dictatorship, which now reigns supreme and is supported by the Cadets and monarchists, is preparation for disbanding the Soviets. Many of the leaders of the S.R.s and Mensheviks, i.e., the present majority in the Soviets, have admitted and expressed this during the past few days, but true to their petty-bourgeois nature, they shrug off this formidable reality with meaningless high-sounding phrases.

2. The leaders of the Soviets and of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties, headed by Tsereteli and Chernov, have completely betrayed the cause of the revolution by putting it in the hands of the counter-revolutionaries and by turning themselves, their parties and the Soviets into mere fig-leaves of the counter-revolution.

Proof of this is that the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks have betrayed the Bolsheviks and have tacitly agreed to close down their papers without daring to tell

the people plainly and openly that they are doing so and why. By sanctioning the disarming of the workers and the revolutionary regiments, they have deprived themselves of all real power. They have turned into the most loud-mouthed ranters who help the reaction to "divert" the people's attention until it is finally ready to disband the Soviets. It is impossible to understand anything at all about the present political situation without realising this complete and final bankruptcy of the S.R.s and Mensheviks and the present majority in the Soviets and without realising that their "Directory" and other masquerades are an absolute sham.

3. All hopes for a peaceful development of the Russian revolution have vanished for good. This is the objective situation: either complete victory for the military dictatorship, or victory for the workers' armed uprising; the latter victory is only possible when it coincides with a deep mass upheaval against the government and the bourgeoisie caused by economic disruption and the prolongation of the war.

The slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" was a slogan for peaceful development of the revolution which was possible in April, May, June, and up to July 5-9, i.e., up to the time when actual power passed into the hands of the military dictatorship. This slogan is no longer correct, for it does not take into account that power has changed hands and that the revolution has in fact been completely betrayed by the S.R.s and Mensheviks. Reckless actions, revolts, partial resistance, or hopeless hit-and-run attempts to oppose reaction will not help. What will help is a clear understanding of the situation, endurance and determination of the workers' vanguard, preparation of forces for the armed uprising, for the victory of which conditions at present are extremely difficult, but still possible if the facts and trends mentioned in the thesis coincide. Let us have no constitutional or republican illusions of any kind, no more illusions about a peaceful path, no sporadic actions, no yielding *n o w* to provocation from the Black Hundreds and Cossacks. Let us muster our forces, reorganise them and resolutely prepare for the armed uprising, if the course of the crisis permits it on a really mass, country-wide scale. The transfer of land to the peasants is impossible at pres-

ent without an armed uprising, since the counter-revolutionaries, having taken power, have completely united with the landowners as a class.

The aim of the insurrection can only be to transfer power to the proletariat, supported by the poor peasants, with a view to putting our Party programme into effect.

4. The party of the working class, without abandoning legal activity but never for a moment overrating it, must *combine* legal with illegal work, as it did in 1912-14.

Don't let a single hour of legal work slip by. But don't cherish any constitutional or "peaceful" illusions. Form illegal organisations or cells everywhere and at once for the publication of leaflets, etc. Reorganise immediately, consistently, resolutely, all along the line.

Act as we did in 1912-14, when we could speak about overthrowing tsarism by a revolution and an armed uprising, without at the same time losing our legal base in the Duma, the insurance societies, the trade unions, etc.

Written on July 10 (23), 1917

Published on August 2 (July 20), 1917 in *Proletarskoye Dyelo* No. 6
Signed: *W.*

Printed from the original

LETTER OVER THE PUBLICATION OF "LEAFLET ON THE CAPTURE OF RIGA"[553]

This leaflet cannot, of course, be published legally, but everything must be done to have it published illegally. It would be extremely stupid of us to jeopardise our legal newspapers (which are so terribly important for us, and which it has taken such a great effort to keep going) and fail to do what we had managed to do in 1912-14: to use our legal possibilities. We should neither print the article (leaflet) legally nor spoil it by rewriting it for legal publication.

It would be not only stupid but base on our part to *confine* ourselves to the legal word, when its freedom has so drastically been curtailed by the government and is being further curtailed from day to day.

I am aware that the sluggishness of our Bolsheviks is

great and that it will take a great deal of effort to secure the publication of illegal leaflets. But I shall go on insisting because those are the demands of life, the demands of the movement.

We must issue illegally free leaflets and handbills which are not curtailed and which speak out at the top of their voice. They should be signed: "A group of persecuted Bolsheviks". We can confine ourselves to that signature or add below in small type: "The group of persecuted Bolsheviks consists of those Bolsheviks whom the government's persecution has forced to work illegally." Or: "The group of persecuted Bolsheviks consists of Bolsheviks whom the government's persecution and withdrawal of press freedom have forced to publish free leaflets illegally, and to act outside the framework of the legal Bolshevik Party."

LEAFLET ON THE CAPTURE OF RIGA

Workers, soldiers and all working people!

The enemy troops have taken Riga. We have suffered another heavy defeat. The incredible calamities inflicted on the people by the war are being aggravated and dragged out.

Why is the war being dragged out? The reason is still a division of the spoils between the capitalist brigands, the point at issue is still whether the German capitalist predators will retain Belgium, Serbia, Poland, Riga, etc., whether the British capitalist predators will retain Baghdad and the German colonies they have seized, whether the Russian capitalist predators will retain Armenia, etc. The Kerensky government, with the participation and support of the Mensheviks and the S.R.s, has been brazenly cheating the people, lulling them with empty talk about their desire for peace, talk which is not binding in any way, while actually dragging out the predatory war, and refusing to publish the secret treaties which the tsar concluded with the British and French capitalists for the enrichment of the Russian capitalists who had been promised Constantinople, Galicia and Armenia.

Even under the Republic, the Russian people are shedding their blood for the fulfilment of the secret treaties, the predatory treaties between the capitalists.

For months, the "republicans", Kerensky, Skobelev, Chernov & Co., have been cheating the Russian workers and peasants, instead of abrogating the secret predatory treaties, instead of offering precise, clear-cut and fair peace terms to all the belligerent nations.

Kerensky together with the Mensheviks and the S.R.s has cheated the people. Only a workers' government can save the country, and safeguard it from the losses of the war and the plunder of the capitalist marauders.

In connection with the Riga defeat, the bourgeoisie is already anticipating the introduction of new harsh laws and strict disciplinary measures against soldiers, workers and peasants. Already the peasants are being deprived of their grain, while, through the blocking of workers' control, the capitalists are allowed to retain their outrageously high profits and to safeguard their sacrosanct "commercial secrets", which shield the bankers and millionaires from exposure.

Meanwhile, the Mensheviks and the S.R.s, disgracefully crawling to the bourgeoisie, continue to give it their support and shout about the need to "leave off" "all party strife", which means leaving full power in the hands of the capitalists, and the country's continued plunder by them, and leaving them the "freedom" to protract the war....

Tens and hundreds of thousands of people have died in the offensive, which the Kerensky, Menshevik, and S.R. government started in June. Tens and hundreds of thousands will die in the protracted war, so long as the people continue to tolerate such a government.

Only a workers' government can save the country. It alone will not cheat the people, but will immediately offer to all countries precise, clear-cut and fair peace terms.

The bourgeoisie has been trying to intimidate the people and create a panic, in an effort to get the ignorant people to believe that peace cannot be offered right away, as this would mean "losing Riga" and so on. That is cheating the people.

Even if peace were to be negotiated by the governments, i.e., the governments safeguarding the sacred rights of the capitalists to their plundered wealth and seizures of foreign lands (annexations), even then the offer of peace would not mean abandonment of Riga. Riga is the booty of the German capitalist brigands. Armenia is the booty of the Russian capitalist brigands. When brigands negotiate on peace they either each keep their own booty or swap pieces of it. That is how all wars have ended and will end, so long as power remains in the hands of the capitalists.

But we speak of a *workers'* government which alone can offer just peace terms right away, and this has been stated hundreds of times by workers and peasants throughout Russia in their countless mandates and resolutions. These terms are: peace without annexations, i.e., without the seizure of foreign lands. This means: neither the Germans nor the Russians will be able forcibly, without the voluntary consent of the Poles, to integrate Poland or the Latvian Territory; neither the Turks nor the Russians will be able to seize Armenia, and so on.

These just peace terms will at once be offered by a workers' government to all the belligerent countries without exception. Until this has been done, until precise, clear-cut, formal proposals of peace have been made, until there has been an overthrow of the total power of the marauding capitalists, who are making hundreds of millions on war contracts, and so long as the secret predatory treaties remain intact—all talk of peace comes to nothing but gross and utterly shameless deception of the people.

All the capitalist governments, including the Kerensky, S.R. and Menshevik government, have been practising this deception

of the people. They have all been mouthing phrases of peace, which are not binding in any way, no one has been offering any precise peace terms, no one has abrogated the secret treaties, and in fact everyone has continued to drag out the criminal predatory war over the capitalists' profits, which is ruining the peoples.

Down with the war! Down with the Kerensky, Menshevik and S.R. government, which is cheating the people, protracting the war, safeguarding the predatory interests of the capitalists, putting off the elections to the Constituent Assembly!

Only a workers' government supported by the poor peasants will offer peace, putting an end to the capitalist plunder, and give the working people bread and freedom. Let every worker and soldier explain to the people the need to overthrow the Kerensky government and set up a workers' government.

Written after August 22
(September 4), 1917

First published in 1962 in Vol. 34 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from a typewritten copy

FROM THE THESES FOR A REPORT AT THE OCTOBER 8 CONFERENCE OF THE ST. PETERSBURG ORGANISATION, AND ALSO FOR A RESOLUTION AND INSTRUCTIONS TO THOSE ELECTED TO THE PARTY CONGRESS[554]

ON THE LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY[555]

The list of candidates published by the Central Committee has been compiled in an inadmissible manner and calls for the sharpest protest. The point is that there must be four or five times more workers in a peasant Constituent Assembly, because they alone are capable of establishing close and intimate ties with the peasant deputies. It is absolutely inadmissible also to have an excessive number of candidates from among people who have but recently joined our Party and have not yet been tested (like Larin). In filling the list with such candidates who should first have worked in the Party for months and months, the C.C. has thrown wide open the door for careerists who scramble for seats in the Constituent Assembly. There is need for an urgent review and correction of the list.

NOTE TO THESIS "ON THE LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY"

It goes without saying that from among the mezhraiontsi[556] who have been hardly tested in proletarian work in our Party's *spirit*, no one would contest the candidature of, say, Trotsky, for, first, upon his arrival, Trotsky at once took up an internationalist stand; second, he worked among the mezhraiontsi for a merger; third, in the difficult July days he proved himself equal to the task and a loyal supporter of the party of the revolutionary proletariat. Clearly, as much cannot be said about many of the new Party members entered on the list.

Larin's nomination is especially scandalous (apart from his being placed ahead of Petrovsky, Krylenko and others...). During the war, Larin *helped the chauvinists*, spoke *on their behalf* at the Swedish congress, and helped to print lies against the St. Petersburg workers and their boycott of the War Industries Committees. During the war, before the revolution, Larin did not once show himself to be a *fighter* for internationalism. Upon his return to Russia, Larin long helped the Mensheviks and even came out in the press with indecent attacks against our Party, in the Alexinsky spirit. Larin is well known for his "swings": let us recall his pamphlet on the labour congress and on a merger with the S.R.s.

Of course, there would be no need to recall all this, if Larin entered the Party with a desire to reform. But to get him into the Constituent Assembly within a week or so of his entry into the Party is *in fact* to transform the Party into the same kind of dirty stall for careerists as most of the European parties are.*

The serious work in the Constituent Assembly will consist in establishing close, intimate *ties* with the peasants. Only workers who are in touch with peasant life are fit for this. To pack the Constituent Assembly with orators and

---

* What about M. N. Pokrovsky's candidature? In 1907, he moved away from the Bolsheviks and remained on the sidelines for years. It would be a good thing if he came back for good. But this has first to be proved by long effort.

writers is to take the beaten track of opportunism and chauvinism. That is unworthy of the "Third International".

Written between September 29 and October 4 (October 2 and 17), 1917

First published in full in 1962 in Vol. 34 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*

Printed from a typewritten copy

"THE LANDOWNERS HAVE HIT IT OFF WITH THE CADETS"

That is not our expression. It was used by the newspaper *Dyelo Naroda*[557] No. 170 of October 3, quoting the words of "a provincial worker" who described what had happened in Russia in the summer and autumn of 1917. *Dyelo Naroda* is known to be the chief official organ of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. Former Minister Chernov is on its Editorial Board.

The admission of such a paper is especially valuable. Here it is:

"The landowners have hit it off with the Cadets, according to a provincial worker. In plainer language, this means that the landowners have found sympathy and support among some elements of the government in the centre and in the localities, that they have recovered from the first shock and have started to organise.... Attacks on the land committees have started and have been growing from day to day, first in the form of a cornucopia of complaints and wails about 'robberies', 'arbitrary acts', and 'pogroms'.... The complaints were followed by restrictive circulars from above and judicial prosecution of the land committees, and in the localities close to the front, also by interference from the military authorities in the form of orders issued by General Kornilov. Even here, in Petrograd, the Ministry of Justice has also threatened to institute criminal proceedings against the Chief Land Committee.

"The cancellation of pre-revolutionary leasehold contracts is the most frequent pretext for the commission for trial and the filing of civil suits. The landowners and all those who are with them have been saying in one voice: the law on contracts has not been rescinded, which means that all the contracts are still valid, and 'no committees or private persons' have the right to cancel them.... So the 'unwary' committees are being massively struck down by the old justice for cancelling the contracts and reducing the leasehold prices. The fact is, however, that such reductions are absolutely inevitable and hardly any contract has remained intact anywhere."

(The paper goes on to give the evidence of a "most moderate Professor Kablukov" who says that the short-term peasant tenant is sometimes "*worse off than the serf*....")

"In these circumstances, cancellation of the shackling leasehold contracts, concluded before the revolution, far from being a crime, was a direct duty of the organs of power.... The effort to keep a section of the peasant tenants 'worse off than the serfs' at any price was a downright provocation to riot, a provocation which was the more criminal in that it was carried out exclusively in the interests of the class of feudal-minded landowners, and at a time when the republic and the whole people are suffering the greatest calamities.... It is no accident, after all, that pogroms have broken out and the 'nests' of the gentry are in flames precisely in Tambov Gubernia, where the number of committees put on trial is great...."

That is what is said in the newspaper *Dyelo Naroda*, the official organ of the ministerial party of S.R.s.

These lines should be reprinted everywhere, issued as leaflets, and circulated in millions of copies among the peasants, because they contain proof, given by the S.R.s (Socialist-Revolutionaries) themselves and quoted by V. Chernov's own paper, proof that the S.R.s have *betrayed* the peasants to the landowners, that the S.R. Party has *betrayed* the peasantry, and that if it has not *also* "hit it off" with the landowners, it has at any rate *surrendered* to them.

The people must be given the chance to read and reread these lines. Every class-conscious peasant, soldier and worker must give thought to the meaning of these admissions.

Seven months of the revolution have passed. Countless times the people have expressed their confidence in the S.R.s, have given them majorities at elections, and said to the S.R. Party: lead on, we entrust you with the leadership! Since March 1917, the S.R. Party in the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies has been operating in a bloc (alliance) with the *Mensheviks*, and has had a *majority* for months and months! Since May 6, members of the Party of S.R.s and Mensheviks have been *and still are* ministers and deputy ministers *together* with the "despicable Cadets", *alongside* the "despicable Cadets", *in alliance* with the "despicable Cadets"!!

Dyelo Naroda has itself admitted the results of this coalition (alliance, agreement) with the despicable Cadets *and the landowners*.

Seven months of the revolution, seven months of the democratic republic, seven months of S.R. and Menshevik domination in the Soviets have resulted in a "vast" number of members of the land committees *put on trial*—trial under the *old justice*, by the old courts, by the tsarist-landowner courts; they have resulted in peasant *revolts* in Tambov and other gubernias!

That is the result of the peasants' trusting the S.R. Party. Meanwhile, the new draft land bill of the S.R. Minister S. L. Maslov shows again and again how the S.R.s have betrayed the peasants (see article by this author: "Socialist-Revolutionary Party Cheats the Peasants Once Again"*).

Written after October 20 (November 2), 1917

First published on October 24 (November 6), 1917 in the newspaper *Derevenskaya Byednota* No. 11

Printed from the *Derevenskaya Byednota* text

LETTER TO Y. M. SVERDLOV

To Comrade Sverdlov.

I learnt only last night that Zinoviev had issued a *written* denial of his participation in Kamenev's statement in *Novaya Zhizn*.

Why then have you not sent me anything???

I sent all the letters about Kamenev and Zinoviev to C.C. members *only*.—You know this; is it not strange then that you seem to doubt it?

It looks as if I will not be able to attend the Plenary Meeting, because "they are looking for me". If *you* (+ Stalin, Sokolnikov and Dzerzhinsky) demand a compromise on the Zinoviev and Kamenev affair,[558] enter a proposal *against* me, to have the case referred to a Party court (the facts are clear that Zinoviev was also *thwarting* it deliberately); this will be a postponement.

* See present edition, Vol. 26, pp. 228-33.—*Ed*.

"Kamenev's resignation has been accepted"? From the C.C.? Please let me have the text of his statement.

Cancellation of the Cossacks' demonstration is a great *victory*.[559] Hurrah! If we *attack* with *all our strength*, we shall fully win out in a few days! Best regards! Yours.

Written on October 22 or 23 (November 4 or 5), 1917

First published in 1957 in the book *Oktyabrskoye vooruzhonnoye vosstaniye v Petrograd* (October Armed Uprising in Petrograd), Moscow, U.S.S.R. Academy of Science Publishers

Printed from the original

NOTES

[1] *The League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class* was organised by Lenin in the autumn of 1895. It united about twenty Marxist workers' circles in St. Petersburg. The work of the League was based on the principles of centralism and strict discipline. It was headed by a Central Group, which included V. I. Lenin, A. A. Vaneyev, P. K. Zaporozhets, G. M. Krzhizhanovsky, N. K. Krupskaya, L. Martov (Y. O. Tsederbaum), M. A. Silvin, and V. V. Starkov. Immediate guidance on every aspect of the work came from five members of this group led by Lenin. The organisation was subdivided into district groups connected with factories and plants through forward-looking, class-conscious workers (like I. V. Babushkin and V. A. Shelgunov). At the plants there were organisers for the collection of information and distribution of literature, and workers' circles were set up at the major enterprises.

The League was the first in Russia to bring together socialism and the working-class movement, going forward from the propaganda of Marxism among a small number of leading workers in circles to political agitation among broad masses of the proletariat. It guided the working-class movement, tying in the workers' struggle for economic demands with the political struggle against tsarism. The influence of the League spread well beyond St. Petersburg. On its initiative, the workers' circles in Moscow, Kiev Yekaterinoslav and other cities and regions of Russia united into similar leagues.

In December 1895, the tsarist government dealt the League a heavy blow: on the night of the 8th (20th), many of its leaders, including Lenin, were arrested. In response to the arrest, a leaflet was issued, formulating political demands and proclaiming the existence of the League.

While in prison, Lenin continued to direct the League's activities, sending out coded letters and leaflets, and wrote a pamphlet *On Strikes* (which is yet to be discovered) and "Draft and Explanation of the Social-Democratic Party Programme" (see present edition, Vol. 2, pp. 93-121).

The importance of the League lay in the fact that, as Lenin said, it was the first important embryo of a revolutionary party relying on the working-class movement and directing the proletariats' class struggle.

"*Communication on behalf of the 'Stariki' to the Members of the St. Petersburg League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class*" was written by Lenin in prison in 1896 as a warning

to the League members at liberty against the provocateur N. Mikhailov. It was written between the lines of page 240 of N. I. Tezyakov's book, *Agricultural Workers and the Organisation of Sanitary Supervision over Them in Kherson Gubernia* (1896), which Lenin was reading for his work *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*.

Apparently for reasons of secrecy, the manuscript contains a great number of abbreviations and is written in a very fine hand with a plain lead pencil poorly visible in places, which is why some of it has not been deciphered. p. 33

[2] The student organisation bearing the name of "*corporation*" was set up in St. Petersburg University at the end of 1891 from students' self-education circles. It united revolutionary-minded young people, but had no specified political programme and broke up within a few months. Its members were betrayed to the police by N. Mikhailov, who was one of its organisers but was connected with the secret police. p. 33

[3] *The Strike at the Voronin factory* (a cotton-weaving manufactory owned by the merchant I. A. Voronin) was staged at the end of January 1894 and was caused by a cut in rates which led to a drop in wages. It continued for three days and ended in a victory for the workers: the rates were increased. Several workers, accused of being instigators, were arrested and deported from St. Petersburg. p. 33

[4] *Narodovoltsi*—members of the Narodnaya Volya (the People's Will), a secret political organisation of Narodnik terrorists which arose in August 1879 as a result of the split within the Narodnik organisation known as Zemlya i Volya (Land and Freedom). The Narodnaya Volya was headed by an Executive Committee consisting, among others, of A. I. Zhelyabov, A. D. Mikhailov, M. F. Frolenko, N. A. Morozov, V. N. Figner, S. L. Perovskaya and A. A. Kvyatkovsky. The Narodovoltsi, remaining utopian socialists, took the path of political struggle, and regarded as their main task the overthrow of the autocracy and the gaining of political freedom. Their programme provided for the organisation of a "permanent people's representation" elected on the basis of universal suffrage, proclamation of democratic freedoms, transfer of the land to the people and the working out of measures for the transfer of factories and plants to the workers. Lenin wrote: "The Narodnaya Volya members made a step forward when they took up the political struggle, but they failed to connect it with socialism" (present edition, Vol. 8, p. 72).

The Narodovoltsi waged a heroic struggle against the tsarist autocracy. But proceeding from their erroneous theory of active "heroes" and the passive "crowd", they expected to achieve the reconstruction of society without the people's participation, through their own efforts, and by individual acts of terrorism to intimidate and disorganise the government. Following the assassination of Tsar Alexander II on March 1, 1881, the government crushed the

Narodnaya Volya by provocations, fierce reprisals and executions.

Lenin, while criticising the erroneous and utopian programme of the Narodovoltsi, spoke with great respect about their selfless struggle against tsarism and put a high value on their conspiratorial techniques and strictly centralised organisation. p. 34

[5] The draft agreement with P. B. Struve was worked out as a result of the talks held by V. I. Lenin, V. I. Zasulich and A. N. Potresov with Struve, which had been started on Potresov's initiative on December 29, 1900 (see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 380-82). The "legal Marxists" (mentioned in the document as the Svoboda [Freedom] democratic opposition group) Struve and M. I. Tugan-Baranovsky wanted the establishment of an illegal organ abroad (suggesting the name of *Sovremennoye Obozreniye* [Contemporary Review]) to be published parallel with *Iskra* and *Zarya*, but not openly connected with the Social-Democrats. The Editorial Board of *Iskra* and *Zarya* agreed to participate in the publication, hoping to obtain political material and reports for *Iskra* through Struve, but stipulated that the new organ should appear not more often than *Zarya* and as a supplement to it. The Editorial Board was to consist, on an equal footing, of the *Iskra* Editorial Board, and Struve and Tugan-Baranovsky.

The talks revealed that Struve intended to use the Editorial Board of *Iskra* and *Zarya* to cater for *Sovremennoye Obozreniye* and was trying to turn it into an organ competing with *Iskra* in volume, content and frequency of publication. When the draft agreement was being worked out, Struve rejected Clause 7, which had been proposed by the *Iskra* and *Zarya* group and which gave the *Iskra* Editorial Board a completely free hand in making use of all the political material received by *Sovremennoye Obozreniye*. Lenin set out the content of the talks with Struve in a letter to G. V. Plekhanov on January 30, 1901, and came out strongly for breaking off the talks (see present edition, Vol. 34, pp. 55-57). The subsequent talks ended in a complete break. p. 34

[6] *Zarya* (Dawn)—a Marxist scientific and political journal published in Stuttgart in 1901 and 1902 by the *Iskra* Editorial Board. Altogether four issues (three books) of *Zarya* made their appearance: No. 1 in April 1901 (actually March 23, new style), No. 2-3 in December 1901, and No. 4 in August 1902.

Zarya's tasks were defined in a draft declaration by the *Iskra* and *Zarya* Editorial Board, written by Lenin in Russia (see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 320-30). In view of the fact that during the discussion of the publication of these organs abroad, jointly with the Emancipation of Labour group, it had been decided to publish *Zarya* legally and *Iskra* illegally, the declaration of the *Iskra* Editorial Board in October 1900 no longer made mention of *Zarya*.

The journal *Zarya* criticised international and Russian revisionism and came out in defence of the theoretical principles of Marxism. Some of Lenin's works, including "The Persecutors of the Zemstvo and the Hannibals of Liberalism" and "The

Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy", were published in *Zarya*. p. 35

[7] A reference to Minister of Finance S. Y. Witte's confidential minute, "The Autocracy and the Zemstvo" (1899), with an introduction and notes by R.N.S. (P. B. Struve), published by the Zarya Publishers in 1901. p. 35

[8] *The Zemstvos* were introduced in the central gubernias of Russia in 1864 and were local organs of self-government led by the gentry. Their writ was confined to local economic matters (hospitals, highways, statistics, insurance, etc.). Their activity was entirely under the control of the governors and the tsarist Ministry of the Interior, who could suspend any decisions the government did not like. p. 36

[9] A reference to the newspaper *Iskra*, the first all-Russia illegal Marxist newspaper, founded by Lenin in 1900, which played a decisive part in organising the revolutionary Marxist party of the working class.

The first issue of Lenin's *Iskra* dated December 1900 appeared in Leipzig; subsequent issues appeared in Munich; from July 1902, in London; and from the spring of 1903, in Geneva. German Social-Democrats, Clara Zetkin, Adolf Braun and others, the Polish revolutionary Julian Marchlewski who was living in Munich at the time, and Harry Quelch, a leader of the British Social-Democratic Federation, rendered great assistance in starting the newspaper (organising a secret printing-press, buying Russian type, etc.).

On *Iskra*'s Editorial Board were V. I. Lenin, G. V. Plekhanov, L. Martov, P. B. Axelrod, A. N. Potresov and V. I. Zasulich. Its secretary was I. G. Smidovich-Lehmann, and from the spring of 1901, N. K. Krupskaya, who was also in charge of *Iskra*'s correspondence with Social-Democratic organisations in Russia. Lenin was the virtual editor-in-chief and head of *Iskra*; he wrote articles on all the cardinal aspects of Party organisation and the class struggle of the proletariat in Russia

Iskra became the centre round which the Party forces rallied and which gathered and trained the Party cadres. R.S.D.L.P. groups and committees, supporting the views put forward by Lenin's *Iskra*, were set up in a number of cities in Russia (St. Petersburg, Moscow, Samara, etc.) and the *Iskra* organisation in Russia was set up at a congress of *Iskra* followers in Samara in January 1902.

On Lenin's initiative and with his direct participation, the *Iskra* Editorial Board worked out a draft Party programme (published in *Iskra* No. 21) and prepared the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. In a special resolution, the Congress noted the exceptional role played by *Iskra* in the struggle for the Party and proclaimed it the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P.

Soon after the Second Congress of the Party, the Mensheviks, with Plekhanov's support, took over control of *Iskra*. From its No. 52 *Iskra* ceased to be an organ of revolutionary Marxism. p. 36

[10] Lenin's remarks on the article by D. B. Ryazanov "Two Truths", written in the summer of 1901 for the magazine *Zarya*. The article was rejected by the editors and was not published in the magazine.
The pages indicated by Lenin are those of Ryazanov's MS., which he submitted to the *Zarya* Editorial Board. p. 36

[11] See Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, "Letter to the Editorial Board of *Otechestvenniye Zapiski*, November 1877", Moscow, 1965, pp. 311-13. p. 36

[12] *Noumena and phenomena*—opposite concepts in Kant's idealistic philosophy.
Kant held a noumenon to be an incognisable thing in itself, which existed independently of man's consciousness and was beyond his grasp. A phenomenon exited only in the mind and was an object of cognition.
This antithesis between noumena and phenomena, which is one of the main propositions of Kant's subjective idealist epistemology, is used by the ideologists of imperialism and revisionists in their fight against materialism.
Dialectical materialism rejected this antithesis and proved that Kant's theory is wrong. p. 38

[13] The Party Programme adopted by the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. in 1903 was worked out by the Editorial Board of Lenin's *Iskra* at the end of 1901 and the first half of 1902. Lenin played an outstanding part in working out the draft. The preparatory material dates from January-February 1902; it is a reflection of key moments in the working out of the draft programme by the *Iskra* Editorial Board: Lenin's study of the first draft of Plekhanov's programme; his work on his own draft of the theoretical section of the programme and his participation in writing the collective draft of the practical section of the programme. All materials are printed from the originals, with variants of paragraphs or parts of paragraphs printed side by side to facilitate comparison. For the preparatory material for the R.S.D.L.P. Programme see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 15-76. p. 38

[14] *Cut-off lands*—lands cut off from peasants' allotments in favour of landowners during the Peasant Reform in Russia in 1861. As a rule, the peasants were deprived of their best lands, which is why the cut-off lands were a means used by landowners to enslave the peasants, and slowed down the elimination of feudal relations in land tenure. p. 39

[15] *Royal demesnes* are lands which belonged to the royal family. p. 48

[16] G. V. Plekhanov's and P. B. Axelrod's remarks on Lenin's article "The Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy" were written on the back of the original between April 20 and May 1 (May 3 and 14), 1902. Lenin's replies were also written on the back of the original on May 1 (14), 1902, at the same time as his letter to Plekhanov (see present edition, Vol. 34, p. 103); the concluding part of Lenin's replies (pp. 68-69) was written on

separate sheets appended to the original of the article. Each of the replies was preceded by an extract from the article to which the remarks referred. Lenin used thin lines to underscore Plekhanov's text. p. 53

[17] A reference to Karl Marx's *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1962, pp. 13-48) and Engels's "Zur Kritik des sozialdemokratischen Programmentwurfes 1891" (Criticism of the Draft Social-Democratic Programme of 1891) (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1962, Bd. 22, S. 272-91). p. 56

[18] *The Valuyev Commission*—a commission set up to inquire into the state of agriculture in Russia and headed by tsarist Minister P. A. Valuyev. In 1872 and 1873, it collected extensive material on the state of agriculture in Russia following the 1861 Reform, and this was published in a book entitled *Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Present State of Agriculture and Agricultural Productivity in Russia*, St. Petersburg, 1873. p. 57

[19] A general strike in support of the demand for universal suffrage put forward in Parliament by representatives of the Labour, Liberal and Democratic parties. The strike involved over 300,000 workers, who staged demonstrations throughout the country. However, when Parliament rejected the Bill and troops fired on the demonstrators, the opportunist leadership of the Labour Party (Vandervelde and others) capitulated and, under the pressure of their "allies" from the camp of the liberal bourgeoisie, called off the general strike. The defeat of the working class in Belgium in April 1902 was a lesson for the working-class movement of the world. p. 61

[20] *Vestnik Russkoi Revolutsii. Sotsialno-politicheskoye obozreniye* (Herald of the Russian Revolution. Socio-Political Review)—an illegal magazine published in Paris and Geneva from 1901 to 1905. Four issues appeared. From No. 2 on it was a theoretical organ of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. p. 62

[21] A reference to the following remark by L. Martov at the Zurich conference of the *Iskra* Editorial Board on April 2 (15), 1902: "We should emphasise and bring out the reactionary character of the demand for the nationalisation of the land in Russia at the present moment."

After the Zurich conference, Lenin made several changes in Chapter VII, which deals with the demand for the nationalisation of the land (see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 137-40). p. 63

[22] A reference to the following remark by L. Martov: "It must be said instead that we accept the nationalisation of the land only as an immediate prelude to the socialisation of all the means of production." p. 64

[23] A reference to rewards given by the government of Charles X to former émigrés whose lands were confiscated and sold as national property during the French bourgeois revolution at the end of the

eighteenth century. The law on compensation adopted on March 27, 1825, provided for pecuniary rewards totalling 1,091,360,000 francs (the "émigré billion"). Members of the royal retinue got the biggest rewards. To obtain this vast sum of money, the government increased taxes and converted the 5 per cent state rent to 3 per cent. p. 66

[24] A reference to Plekhanov's remark on the following part of the article: "But why confine oneself to this source? Why not try, in addition, to return to the people at least part of the tribute which yesterday's slave-owners extracted, and are still extracting, from the peasants with the assistance of the police state?" (See present edition, Vol. 6, p. 142.) Plekhanov wrote: "That is the only thing that should be proposed, and not charity. Only those who received the amounts can be expected to return them: *the gentry*." p. 66

[25] A reference to the following remark by L. Martov: "This proposition is wrong. Freedom to demand a separate plot flows *precisely* from the freedom to dispose of the land. It is enough to point out instead that the transformation of the power of the commune over the individual into the power of an association over the member who joins on his own accord is not ruled out by our demands."

After the Zurich conference, Lenin crossed out both sentences in the original and wrote instead: "This objection would be groundless" ending with "put up for sale by a fellow member" (p. 67). p. 67

[26] The leaflet of the Don Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. "To the Citizens of Russia", issued on May 9 (22), 1902, was circulated among workers in a total of 2,000 copies. It said that the blood of Balmashev, who had been sentenced to death by a military tribunal for the assassination of Minister Sipyagin, "will wash the eyes of the blinded philistines and make them see the indescribable horror of the autocracy in Russia. Let them see that our struggle against it is growing and spreading. Masses of peasants are already coming to the assistance of the workers and a handful of unhypocritical intellectuals. The first signs are already in evidence: in Tula the soldiers have refused to shoot at the strikers; a peasant uprising has broken out in Poltava and Kharkov gubernias. For centuries the muzhik there had been working for the benefit of his lord, for centuries he had suffered oppression and privation, and his patience has finally come to an end." The tsarist government hastened to the rescue of the landowners and started fierce reprisals. The leaflet went on: "We have had enough of this slavish and ignominious forbearance, we have had enough of sacrifice.... Citizens! Stem the endless tide of this horrible bloodletting! Overthrow the autocracy!" p. 69

[27] *Socialist-Revolutionaries* (*S.R.s*)—a petty-bourgeois party in Russia which originated at the end of 1901 and the beginning of 1902 from the merger of various Narodnik groups and circles (the Union of Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc.). The views of the S.R.s were a jumble of Narodnik and revisionist ideas; they tried, as Lenin put it,

to "patch up the rents in the Narodnik ideas with bits of fashionable opportunist 'criticism' of Marxism" (see present edition, Vol. 9, p. 310). During the First World War, most of the S.R.s took a social-chauvinist stand.

After the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917, the S.R.s and the Mensheviks were the mainstay of the counter-revolutionary bourgeois and landowner Provisional Government, while the party's leaders (Avksentyev, Kerensky and Chernov) were in the government.

At the end of November 1917, the Left wing of the S.R.s formed an independent party of Left S.R.s. In an effort to retain their influence among the peasants, the Left S.R.s gave nominal recognition to the Soviet power and entered into an agreement with the Bolsheviks, but soon began to fight against the Soviets.

During the foreign armed intervention and the Civil War, the S.R.s were engaged in counter-revolutionary subversive activity, giving active support to the interventionists and whiteguards, taking part in counter-revolutionary plots and organising terroristic acts against the leaders of the Soviet state and the Communist Party. After the Civil War, the S.R.s continued their hostile activity inside the country and among the whiteguard émigrés. p. 69

[28] The leaflet "*To the Citizens of All Russia*" was issued by the Don Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. in November 1902 in connection with the strike in Rostov from November 2 to 25 (November 15-December 8).

It refuted the official report in *Pravitelstvenny Vestnik* (Government Herald) about the Rostov events, which described the workers as an "unruly crowd" with crude demands allegedly of an exclusively economic character. The leaflet gave a true picture of the strike, which was expressly political, and described the fierce reprisals of the tsarist troops against the workers and their families. It called on the workers to respond with revolutionary action to the violence of the tsarist government. The leaflet ended with these words:

"Let the fire that has flared up on the Don spread in a terrible conflagration, let the rifle salvoes be echoed by mighty demonstrations, let the groans of the victims be amplified by thunderous protest, let citizens everywhere, as unanimously as in Rostov, pass the death sentence on the autocracy, which is oppressing the country!

"Down with the autocracy!

"Long live the coming revolution!"

The leaflet was published in *Iskra* No. 31 on January 1, 1903, with an editorial introduction by Lenin, and was also issued in a special reprint.

On the copy of the leaflet received by the *Iskra* Editorial Board, there is also the following in Lenin's hand: "Set up *in brevier right away* and issue in a special reprint: *Special impression from No. 31 of* '*Iskra*'", together with a calculation of the number of letters and instructions to the type-setters. p. 70

[29] The pamphlet was never written. p. 70

[30] *Sozialistische Monatshefte* (Socialist Monthly)—a magazine, the chief organ of the German opportunists and one of the organs of international opportunism. It was published in Berlin from 1897 to 1933. During the First World War (1914-18) it took a social-chauvinist stand. p. 71

[31] *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* (Revolutionary Russia)—an illegal S.R. newspaper published in Russia from the end of 1900 by the Union of Socialist-Revolutionaries (No. 1, dated 1900, actually came out in January 1901). From January 1902 to December 1905 it was published in Geneva as the official organ of the S.R. Party. p. 72

[32] A reference to the programme appeal, "From the Peasant Union of the Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries to All the Workers of Revolutionary Socialism in Russia", published in the newspaper *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* No. 8 on June 25, 1902. There is another reference to the appeal in point 3 of section C. p. 72

[33] *Economism*—an opportunist trend within Russian Social-Democracy at the turn of the century, a Russian variety of international opportunism. The Economists' organs were the newspaper *Rabochaya Mysl* (Workers' Thought) (1897-1902) and the magazine *Rabocheye Dyelo* (Workers' Cause) (1899-1902). The so-called Credo, written by Y. D. Kuskova in 1899, was the programme document of the Economists whom Lenin called Russian Bernsteinians.

The views of the Economists were subjected to comprehensive criticism in Lenin's works: "A Protest by Russian Social-Democrats" (aimed against their Credo and written in 1899 when Lenin was exiled in Siberia; it was signed by seventeen exiled Marxists), "A Retrograde Trend in Russian Social-Democracy", "Apropos of the Profession de foi" (see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 167-82, 255-85, 286-96) and "A Talk with Defenders of Economism" (see present edition, Vol. 5, pp. 313-20). Lenin completed the ideological defeat of Economism in his book *What Is To Be Done?* (see present edition, Vol. 5, pp. 347-529). Lenin's *Iskra* played a great part in the struggle against Economism. p. 73

[34] A reference to A. N. Potresov's article "Modern Vestal Virgin (From Sketches of Modern Journalism)", signed "St." and published in the magazine *Zarya* No. 2-3, December 1901. p. 73

[35] *Narodnoye Dyelo* (People's Cause)—a popular organ of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party published in the form of collections (No. 1 was issued as a newspaper) in Geneva from 1902 to 1904; a total of five issues appeared. p. 75

[36] A reference to the article "Concerning *Iskra*'s Polemics"; which appeared in No. 11 of *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* in September 1902. p. 76

[37] A reference to an article which had no title and was signed "S.R." It appeared in a hectographed periodical *Vperyod* No. 5

on September 15, 1902, which was issued in St. Petersburg by *Vperyod*, a circle of Narodnik orientation. p. 76

[38] A quotation from "The Element of Terrorism in Our Programme", an article carried by *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* No. 7 in June 1902. p. 76

[39] A reference to the article "How Are We To Respond to the Government's Brutalities?", which appeared in *Revolutsionnaya Rossiya* No. 12 in October 1902. p. 76

[40] *The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.* was held from July 17 (30) to August 10 (23), 1903. The first 13 sittings were held in Brussels, after which, because of police persecution, the Congress moved to London.

It was prepared by *Iskra*, which under Lenin's guidance put in a tremendous effort to unite Social-Democrats in Russia round the principles of revolutionary Marxism. *Iskra*'s Editorial Board worked out and proposed for discussion at the Congress a draft Party programme (published in *Iskra* No. 21 on June 1, 1902). Several documents for the Congress were written by Lenin: draft Rules of the R.S.D.L.P., several draft resolutions and a plan for the report on *Iskra*'s activity. Lenin also worked out in detail the agenda and the standing orders of the Congress. The draft Rules and the draft agenda of the Congress were communicated beforehand to the members of *Iskra*'s Editorial Board and then to the delegates.

The Congress was attended by 43 delegates with vote, representing 26 organisations. Some delegates had two votes each so that the total of votes at the Congress came to 51. The composition of the Congress was not homogeneous. It was attended not only by supporters of *Iskra*, but also by its opponents, and by unstable and wavering elements. There were 20 items on the agenda of the Congress.

Lenin delivered the report on the Party Rules and spoke in the debate on most of the items of the agenda.

Approval of the Programme and the Rules of the Party and the election of the Party governing centres were the most important questions before the Congress. Lenin and his supporters launched a resolute struggle against the opportunists. The Congress gave a rebuff to the opportunists and approved the Party Programme almost unanimously (with one abstention). It contained a formulation of the immediate tasks of the proletariat in the coming bourgeois-democratic revolution (minimum programme) and the tasks designed for the victory of the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat (maximum programme). For the first time in the international labour movement since the death of Marx and Engels, a revolutionary programme was adopted, which stated, on Lenin's insistence, that the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat was the principal task of the working-class party.

In the debate on the Party Rules there was an acute struggle over the Party's organisational principles. Lenin and his support-

ers wanted to set up a militant revolutionary party of the working class, which is why the wording of the first paragraph of the Rules proposed by Lenin stated that a member must not only accept the Party's Programme and give it financial support, but personally participate in the work of one of its organisations. Martov motioned his own wording of the first paragraph, which stated that a member need only accept the Programme and give the Party financial support, and also give regular personal assistance to the Party under the guidance of one of its organisations. Martov's wording, which facilitated access to the Party for unstable elements, was adopted by a small majority. Otherwise the Congress approved the Rules as worked out by Lenin. The Congress also adopted a number of resolutions on tactical questions.

At the Congress, a split developed between those who consistently supported Lenin's *Iskra* and the "soft" Iskrists, the supporters of Martov. The former received a majority in the election to the Party's central bodies and accordingly took the name of Bolsheviks, while the latter, the opportunists, received a minority and were called Mensheviks.

The Congress was of tremendous importance for the development of the working-class movement in Russia Lenin wrote: "As a current of political thought and as a political party, Bolshevism has existed since 1903" (see present edition, Vol. 31, p. 24). The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. was a turning-point in the international working-class movement, because it set up a new type of proletarian party, which became a model for revolutionary Marxists throughout the world. For more information about the Second Congress see present edition, Vol. 6, pp. 465-507. p. 78

[41] This is a detailed elaboration of the standing orders and agenda for the Congress. Section A was taken as a basis for the standing orders adopted by the Congress. Section B was the draft agenda (*Tagesordnung*) supplied with the commentaries, which, Lenin said, "was known *to all the* "*Iskra*"*-ists long before the Congress* and *to all the delegates* at the Congress" (see present edition, Vol. 7, p. 31).

The initial text of the document was supplemented by Lenin on the strength of remarks received from Martov and possibly other *Iskra* supporters as well who had studied it. The text is here given in full with subsequent addenda and amendments. p. 78

[42] *The Organising Committee* (*O.C.*) *for the Convocation of the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.* was set up at a conference in Pskov on November 2-3 (15-16), 1902.

The first attempt to set up an Organising Committee was made at the Belostok conference of the R.S.D.L.P. committees and organisations (March 23-28 [April 5-10], 1902), which was called on the initiative of the Economists and Bundists. The Organising Committee elected at the conference consisted of representatives of *Iskra*, the Union of Southern Committees and Organisations of the R.S.D.L.P. and the Bund Central Committee; it was

unable to start work because two of its members were arrested soon after the conference.

A conference of *Iskra* supporters, led by Lenin, met in London on August 2 (15), 1902, to set up the nucleus of the Russian O.C. It was decided to invite representatives from the Bund and the *Yuzhny Rabochy* group which at the time showed signs of moving closer to *Iskra*, and also to give the O.C. the right to co-opt members.

A conference of Social-Democratic organisations at which the O.C. was constituted was held in Pskov on November 2-3 (15-16). The conference adopted the text of an "Announcement of the Formation of an Organising Committee", which was published as a leaflet in Russia in December 1902.

In early February 1903, the second O.C. conference was held in Orel. It worked out and adopted draft regulations of the Congress and the list of organisations entitled to attend it. The regulations were circulated among the local committees which were then toured by the members of the O.C. They were adopted and approved by the local organisations, and served as the basis for the Organising Committee's further work in preparing for the Party's Second Congress.

The O.C.'s successful activity, which culminated in the convocation of the Congress, was made possible only by the tremendous work in uniting Russian revolutionary Social-Democrats carried out by *Iskra*'s Editorial Board and the *Iskra* organisation under Lenin's direction. In his book, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, Lenin wrote: "The Organising Committee was mainly a commission set up to convene the Congress, a commission deliberately composed of representatives of different shades, including even the Bundists; while the real work of *creating* the organised unity of the Party was done entirely by the *Iskra* organisation" (see present edition, Vol. 7, p. 277). p. 78

43 *Polish Social-Democrats*—members of the revolutionary party of the Polish working class, which emerged in 1893, first as the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland, and from August 1900, following the congress of Social-Democratic organisations of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania, where the Polish and a section of the Lithuanian Social-Democrats were merged, it was known as the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania (S.D.K.P. and L.). The fact that the party directed the Polish working-class movement towards alliance with the Russian working-class movement and fought against nationalism was to its credit. At the same time, it made a number of mistakes; it failed to understand Lenin's theory of socialist revolution, or the leading role of the party in the democratic revolution; it underestimated the role of the peasantry as an ally of the working class and the importance of the national liberation movement. While criticising the party's erroneous views, Lenin emphasised its services to the Polish revolutionary movement. He noted that Polish Social-Democrats had created "for the first time a purely proletarian party in Poland and proclaimed the extremely impor-

RGM MARX MUSEO NOT FOR COMMERCIAL DISTRIBUTION

tant principle that the Polish and the Russian workers must maintain the closest alliance in their class struggle" (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 434). The Fourth (Unity) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. admitted the S.D.K.P. and L. into the R.S.D.L.P. as a territorial organisation.

The S.D.K.P. and L. welcomed the Great October Socialist Revolution and launched a struggle for the victory of the proletarian revolution in Poland. At the Unity Congress of the S.D.K.P. and L. and the P.P.S.-Lewica in December 1918, the two parties merged to form the Communist Workers' Party of Poland. p. 78

[44] *The Bund* (General Jewish Workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland and Russia) consisted mainly of semi-proletarian elements among Jewish artisans in Russia's western areas. Within the R.S.D.L.P., the Bundists constantly supported its opportunist wing (Economists, Mensheviks and liquidators) and waged a struggle against the Bolsheviks and Bolshevism. p. 80

[45] *The First Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.* was held at Minsk from March 1 to 3 (13-15), 1898. It was attended by nine delegates from six organisations: the St. Petersburg, Moscow, Yekaterinoslav and Kiev organisations of the League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, from the group of the Kiev *Rabochaya Gazeta* and from the Bund. The Congress elected the Party's Central Committee, confirmed *Rabochaya Gazeta* as the Party's official organ, issued a Manifesto and designated the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad as the Party's representative abroad (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK* (C.P.S.U. in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee), Part I, 1954, pp. 11-15).

The importance of the First Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. lay in the fact that its decisions and Manifesto proclaimed the establishment of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, thereby playing a great revolutionary and propagandist part. But the Congress did not adopt a Programme or work out any Party Rules; the Central Committee elected at the Congress was arrested and the Rabochaya Gazeta printing-press was seized, which is why the Congress failed to unite and merge together separate Marxist circles and organisations. The local organisations were not guided from a single centre and there was no single line in their work. p. 80

[46] *Borba* (Struggle)—a Social-Democratic group abroad which included D. B. Ryazanov, Y. M. Steklov (Nevzorov) and E. L. Gurevich (V. Danevich). It was formed in Paris in the summer of 1900 and in May the following year took the name of *Borba*. Its publications ("Materials for the Working out of a Party Programme", parts I-III, "Leaflet of the *Borba* Group", etc.) distorted revolutionary Marxist theory, giving it a doctrinaire and scholastic interpretation and taking a hostile attitude to Lenin's principles of Party organisation. In view of its departures from Social-Democratic ideas and tactics, its disorganising activity and lack of connection with Social-Democratic organisations

in Russia, it was not allowed to attend the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., which adopted a decision to dissolve it (see *Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.* [The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.], 1959, p. 438). p. 81

[47] *Zhizn* (Life)—a literary, scientific and political magazine published in St. Petersburg from 1897 to 1901. Among its contributors were "legal Marxists' (M. I. Tugan-Baranovsky, P. B. Struve and others) and leading writers and critics (A. M. Gorky, A. P. Chekhov, V. V. Veresayev, S. G. Skitalets, I. A. Bunin and Y. A. Solovyov [Andreyevich]). The magazine published Marx's *Wages, Price and Profit* and Lenin's articles "Capitalism in Agriculture (Kautsky's Book and Mr. Bulgakov's Article)" and "Reply to Mr. P. Nezhdanov" (see present edition, Vol. 4, pp. 105-59, 160-65).

Zhizni was closed down by the government in June 1901 and was resumed abroad in April 1902 by the *Zhizn* Social-Democratic group. There were six issues of the magazine, twelve issues of the *Listok Zhizni* (*Zhizni* Handbill) and several publications in the *Biblioteka Zhizni* (*Zhizni* Library) series. The *Zhizn* group had some deviations from Social-Democratic views and tactics, inclining towards Christian socialism and anarchism. It ceased to exist in December 1902 and the publishing business was wound up. p. 81

[48] *Volya* (Will)—a group abroad which called itself a "revolutionary Social-Democratic organisation". In February 1903, it issued a leaflet, "To Revolutionaries from the Revolutionary Social-Democratic Organisation *Volya*", which put forward the task of conducting political agitation among all strata of the population and of uniting Social-Democrats with Socialist-Revolutionaries. The *Volya* group was not a part of the R.S.D.L.P. The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. adopted a resolution "On the Kuklin Publishers Group and the *Volya* Group", which said: "The Congress states that neither of these organisations is within the Party, and that they have nothing in common with organised Social-Democracy in Russia. The question of future relations between these groups and the Party is for the Party's Central Committee to decide in the event these groups apply to it" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 439). Soon after the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., the group announced its dissolution and the entry of its members into the R.S.D.L.P.; an announcement to that effect was inserted in *Iskra* No. 52 on November 7, 1903. p. 82

[49] *The Emancipation of Labour group*—the first Russian Marxist group formed by G. V. Plekhanov in Switzerland in 1883. Among its members were P. B. Axelrod, L. G. Deutsch, V. I. Zasulich and V. N. Ignatov. It did much to spread Marxism in Russia and dealt a serious blow at Narodism, which was the main ideological obstacle to the spread of Marxism and to the development of the Social-Democratic movement in Russia. Written by Plekhanov and published by the Emancipation of Labour group, the two draft programmes of the Russian Social-Democrats (1883 and

1885) were an important step in preparing and creating a Social-Democratic party in Russia. Lenin said that the group "only laid the theoretical foundations for the Social-Democratic movement and took the first step towards the working-class movement" (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 278). Members of the group also made serious mistakes: they overestimated the role of the liberal bourgeoisie and underestimated the revolutionary role of the peasantry as a reserve of the proletarian revolution. These mistakes were the germ of the subsequent Menshevik views held by Plekhanov and other members of the group.

In 1894, the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad was formed on the initiative of the Emancipation of Labour group. Members of the group and their followers left the Union in 1900 and set up a revolutionary organisation, *Sotsial-Demokrat*. G. V. Plekhanov, P. B. Axelrod and V. I. Zasulich were on the Editorial Board of *Iskra* and *Zarya*. At the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., in August 1903, the Emancipation of Labour group announced its dissolution. p. 82

[50] *Iskra's organisation in Russia* united *Iskra* supporters operating inside Russia. During the preparation for publishing *Iskra* and in the first year of its publication (December 1900-December 1901) a network of *Iskra* agents was set up in various towns of Russia. Among them were P. N. Lepeshinsky and O. B. Lepeshinskaya, P. A. Krasikov, A. M. Stopani, G. M. Krzhizhanovsky and Z. P. Krzhizhanovskaya, S. I. Radchenko and L. N. Radchenko, A. D. Tsyurupa, N. E. Bauman and I. V. Babushkin. *Iskra* promotion groups were set up in a number of cities, including St. Petersburg, Pskov, Samara and Poltava.

The growth of the revolutionary movement and the increasing volume of practical work insistently urged the need to unite the *Iskra* forces and place their work on a planned and organised basis, which would help to solve the main task, that of overcoming the amateurish methods introduced by the Economists and winning over the Social-Democratic committees. In this connection, Lenin put forward a plan for an all-Russia *Iskra* organisation, which was to prepare the unification of Social-Democratic organisations in the country into an integrated, centralised Marxist party. This plan was initially set out by Lenin in his article "Where To Begin?" (May 1901) and then elaborated in the pamphlet *What Is To Be Done?* (autumn of 1901-February 1902) (see present edition Vol. 5, pp. 13-24, 347-529).

In implementing the plan for the establishment of an integrated *Iskra* organisation in Russia, Lenin and his supporters had to overcome narrow local (regional) tendencies among some *Iskra* practitioners.

A congress of *Iskra* workers was held in Samara in January 1902 and was attended by G. M. Krzhizhanovsky and Z. P. Krzhizhanovskaya, F. V. Lengnik, M. A. Silvin, V. P. Artsybushev, D. I. Ulyanov, M. I. Ulyanova and others. The congress set up a Bureau of the *Iskra* organisation in Russia.

Armed with Lenin's book *What Is To Be Done?*, *Iskra* workers vigorously set about spreading and realising Lenin's plan for the establishment of the party. The *Iskra* organisation in Russia achieved a great deal in actually uniting party organisations on the principles of revolutionary Marxism. By the end of 1902, almost all the major Social-Democratic committees had announced their solidarity with *Iskra*.

The Organising Committee for Convening the Party's Second Congress, to which the *Iskra* organisations handed over all their connections, was set up at a conference in Pskov on November 2-3 (15-16), 1902, with the most active participation of *Iskra* workers. The *Iskra* organisation in Russia operated until the Second Congress and played an important part in preparing and convoking the Congress, which set up the revolutionary Marxist party in Russia. p. 82

[51] *The "Yuzhny Rabochy" group*—a Social-Democratic group formed in the south of Russia by the autumn of 1900 round a newspaper of the same name. The newspaper *Yuzhny Rabochy* (Southern Worker) was published illegally from 1900 to 1903. Twelve numbers were issued, the first in January 1900 by the Yekaterinoslav Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. At various times, I. Kh. Lalayants, A. Vilensky, O. A. Kogan (Yermansky), B. S. Tseitlin, Y. Y. Levin and Y. S. Levina, V. N. Rozanov and others were members of the group and the Editorial Board.

In contrast to the Economists, the *Yuzhny Rabochy* group believed that the main task of the proletariat was to carry on political struggle for the overthrow of the autocracy. It opposed terrorism, upheld the idea of launching a mass revolutionary movement and carried out considerable revolutionary work in the south of Russia. But the group tended to overrate the role of the liberal bourgeoisie and attached no importance to the peasant movement. In opposition to the *Iskra* plan for creating a centralised Marxist party through the unification of the revolutionary Social-Democrats round *Iskra*, the *Yuzhny Rabochy* group put forward a plan for restoring the R.S.D.L.P. by setting up regional Social-Democratic associatlons. In his *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, Lenin said the *Yuzhny Rabochy* group was one of those organisations "which, while verbally recognising *Iskra* as the leading organ, actually pursued plans of their own and were unstable in matters of principle" (present edition, Vol. 7, p. 209). At the Second Congress of the Party, the *Yuzhny Rabochy* delegates took a Centrist position (Lenin called them "middling opportunists").

The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. decided to dissolve the *Yuzhny Rabochy* group, like all other separate Social-Democratic groups and organisations (see *Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 439). p. 82

[52] *P.P.S.* (*Polska Partia Socjalistyczna—Polish Socialist Party*)—a reformist nationalist Party set up in 1892. It had a programme based on the struggle for an independent Poland, and under the leadership of Pilsudski and his followers it carried on separatist

nationalistic propaganda among the Polish workers in an effort to draw them away from joint struggle with the Russian workers against the autocracy and capitalism

In 1906 it split up into the P.P.S.-Lewica (Left-wing) and the Right-wing, chauvinist P.P.S., known as the "revolutionary faction".

Under the influence of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) and of the S.D.K.P and L. (the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania), the P.P.S. Lewica gradually went over to consistent revolutionary positions.

During the First World War, most of its members took an internationalist stand and in December 1918 merged with the S.D.K.P. and L. These two parties constituted the Communist Workers' Party of Poland (as the Communist Party of Poland was called until 1925).

During the First World War, the Right-wing P.P.S. continued to conduct its national-chauvinist policy. When the bourgeois Polish state was formed, the Right-wing P.P.S. in 1919 united with sections of the P.P.S. on the territory of Poland earlier occupied by Germany and Austria and once again took the name of P.P.S. With the government in its hands, it helped the Polish bourgeoisie to take over power and then launched a systematic anti-communist campaign, supporting the policy of aggression against the Soviet state, and the policy of occupying and oppressing Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia. Some groups in the P.P.S. which disagreed with this policy went over to the Communist Party of Poland.

Following the fascist coup staged by Pilsudski in May 1926, the P.P.S. was nominally in opposition in Parliament, but actually conducted no active struggle against the fascist regime and continued its anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda. In this period, Left-wing elements in the P.P.S. co-operated with the Polish Communists and supported the united-front tactics in a number of campaigns

During the Second World War, the P.P.S. split up once again. Its reactionary and chauvinist section, which called itself "Wolność, Równość, Niepodległość" (Freedom, Equality, Independence), took part in the reactionary Polish government in exile (London). The Left-wing section of the P.P.S., which called itself the Workers' Party of Polish Socialists (W.P.P.S.), under the influence of the Polish Workers' Party (P.W.P.), set up in 1942, joined the popular front of struggle against the nazi invaders, fought for the liberation of Poland from the fascist enslavement and favoured friendship with the U.S.S.R.

In 1944, following the liberation of the eastern part of Poland from the German occupation and the establishment of the Polish Committee of National Liberation, the W.P.P.S. once again took the name of P.P.S. and together with the P.W.P. set about building up a democratic people's Poland. In December 1948, the P.W.P. and the P.P.S. merged into the Polish United Workers' Party (P.U.W.P.). p. 83

[53] *The Amsterdam International Socialist Congress of the Second International* was held from August 14 to 20, 1904. It dealt with the following questions: 1) international rules of socialist tactics; 2) colonial policy; 3) general strike; 4) social policy and workers' insurance; 5) trusts and unemployment, and other questions.

The attitude to bourgeois parties was expressed in a resolution called "International Rules of Socialist Tactics", which prohibited socialists from taking part in bourgeois governments and censured "any urge to gloss over existing class contradictions with a view to facilitating a rapprochement with bourgeois parties". The Congress decisions, while being a step forward, went only a part of the way and were a further concession to opportunism. The Congress failed to raise the question of the mass strike developing into an armed uprising or to give a rebuff to Right-wing opportunists who were inclined to justify the colonial policy of the imperialist powers. While saying that it condemned revisionism, the Congress failed to declare a break with it, and said nothing about the proletarian revolution or the dictatorship of the proletariat.
p. 83

[54] *The Party Council* (1903-05) was set up under the Party Rules adopted by the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. as the highest Party institution designed to co-ordinate and unify the activity of the Central Committee and the Editorial Board of the Central Organ and to restore the C.C. and the Editorial Board of the C.O. in the event the entire membership of either of these bodies was gone, and also to represent the Party in relations with other parties. The Council had the task of convening Party congresses within the period laid down by the Rules or before the due date, upon the demand of Party organisations which together commanded one-half of the congress votes. The Party Council consisted of five members, one of whom was appointed by the Party congress and the others by the Central Committee and the C.O. Editorial Board, which had two members each on the Council. The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. elected G. V. Plekhanov as the fifth member of the Council. Lenin was elected a member of the Council from the C.O. Editorial Board, and from the C.C. when he left *Iskra*. Following Plekhanov's orientation towards opportunism and the Mensheviks' seizure of the Editorial Board, the Party Council became an instrument of the Mensheviks' struggle against the Bolsheviks. Lenin waged a consistent struggle in the Council to unite the Party, exposing the disorganising and splitting activity of the Mensheviks. Under the Rules adopted by the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., the Council was abolished.
p. 84

[55] The first speech is in reply to M. I. Lieber's question: "How are we to understand the point about the national question? Why is it separated out from the point about the draft programme? What is the meaning of the national question being a question of tactics? Why is this question not regarded as a cardinal one?"

The second speech is in reply to another of Lieber's questions:

"How are we to understand the point about national organisations? This question appears to be raised independently of the question of the Bund's status in the Party" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, pp. 17-18).

The first point, mentioned by Lenin, in the list of questions subject to debate at the Congress ("On the Bund's Status in the R.S.D.L.P.") was second on the agenda adopted by the Congress, and point six ("Regional and National Organisations") was seventh. p. 85

[56] Lenin spoke twice on the question of the Organising Committee's actions in calling the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. For his first speech see present edition, Vol. 6, p. 482 and Note 136. The Congress adopted the following resolution:

"With the election of the committee, whose task is to determine the composition of the Congress, the Organising Committee has lost its right as a collegium to exert an influence on the composition of the Congress, and its activity, as a collegium, is deemed to have ceased on this point" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, pp. 37-38). p. 85

[57] The question of the representatives of the S.D.K.P. and L. attending the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. was first raised on the initiative of the *Iskra* Editorial Board in a letter sent by the Organising Committee for the Convocation of the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. to the S.D.K.P. and L. Committee Abroad on February 7, 1903.

The terms on which the Polish Social-Democrats could be united with the R.S.D.L.P. were discussed at the Fourth Congress of the S.D.K.P. and L. which was held from July 11 to 16 (24-29), 1903. The Congress formulated a number of terms for a possible merger, one of them being the demand for a change in the formulation of the R.S.D.L.P.'s Programme clause on the right of nations to self-determination.

When the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. opened, its delegates had no knowledge of this decision. The committee to determine the composition of the Congress and verify mandates, in its report to the Congress on July 18 (31), read out a letter from the Polish Social-Democrat A. Warski (A. S. Warszawski), which it had at its disposal. But the letter did not clarify the relations the Polish Social-Democrats wanted to establish with the R.S.D.L.P. The committee decided to invite the Polish Social-Democrats to attend the Congress with voice only. A. Warski and J. Hanecki arrived at the Congress on July 22 (August 4) and Warski announced the decision of the Fourth Congress of the S.D.K.P. and L. concerning the terms for unification with the R.S.D.L.P. A special committee was elected to examine these terms.

The point on the right of nations to self-determination, raised by the Polish Social-Democrats, was discussed in the Programme Committee. No minutes were taken, but the notes made at the third sitting of the committee by Lenin (see Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, pp. 423-24) show that the

Polish Social-Democrats objected to the point on the right of nations to self-determination and proposed that the programme should contain a demand for the establishment of institutions guaranteeing complete freedom of cultural development for all nations within a state. As Lenin later pointed out: "*instead of* self-determination they practically proposed the notorious 'cultural-national autonomy', only under another name" (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 444). The committee rejected the proposals of the Polish Social-Democrats. Realising that they would be unable to maintain these proposals at the Congress, they left it after making a statement setting out their standpoint. Their statement was read out at the Congress on July 29 (August 11). On August 6 (19), in connection with the report by the committee, which had examined the terms for a merger of the S.D.K.P. and L. with the R.S.D.L.P. as proposed by the Polish Social-Democrats the Congress adopted a resolution expressing regret over the fact that the withdrawal of the Polish Social-Democrats from the Congress deprived it of the possibility of completing the discussion of the S.D.K.P. and L.'s joining the R.S.D.L.P., and instructed the Central Committee to continue the negotiations.

The speech reported here is Lenin's second. The first was given in Vol. 6 of the present edition, p. 483. p. 86

[58] A reference to an amendment to the paragraph of the general section of the draft programme which said: "But as all these contradictions, which are inherent in bourgeois society, increase and develop, the discontent among the labouring and exploited masses with the existing state of things grows, the number and the solidarity of proletarians increase, and their struggle against their exploiters becomes sharper." When this paragraph was discussed by the Programme Committee (a sitting Lenin did not attend) the word "consciousness" was inserted after the words "the number and the solidarity".

The amendment was rejected by the Congress, with a majority voting for the original wording. p. 86

[59] The point at issue is §1 of the general political demands of the draft Party programme, which was given the following wording by the Programme Committee: "The sovereignty of the people, that is, concentration of all the supreme state power in the hands of a legislative assembly constituting a single chamber and made up of representatives of the people" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 179). K. M. Takhtarev (Strakhov) proposed that the words "sovereignty of the people" should be substituted by the words "supremacy of the people". His amendment was rejected by the Congress. p. 86

[60] A reference to §3 of the general political demands of the draft Party programme tabled by the Programme Committee and containing a demand for broad local and regional self-government. p. 87

[61] A reference to §9 of the general political demands of the draft

programme (§8 of the *Iskra* draft), which said: "The granting to every citizen of the right to institute judicial proceedings against any person in office without lodging a complaint with his superiors". V. N. Krokhmal (Fomin) proposed that the word "citizen" should be followed by "and to every foreigner". The Congress rejected the proposal. p. 87

[62] In the discussion of §12 of the general political demands of the draft programme (§9 of the *Iskra* draft), which said that the standing army should be substituted by the "universal arming of the people", Lieber proposed that the word "militia" should be used instead of the "universal arming of the people". Lieber's proposal was rejected by the Congress. p. 87

[63] The draft proposals here published were tabled by Lenin at a sitting of the Programme Committee during the second discussion of the wording of §7 of the general political demands of the Party Programme (§6 of the *Iskra* draft).

In the *Iskra* draft programme this paragraph contained a demand for the abolition of the social estates and full equality of rights for all citizens, regardless of sex, creed or race. During the initial discussion, the end of the paragraph had been reworded as follows: "Creed, race, nationality and language", and was so tabled at the 16th sitting of the Congress on July 30 (August 12). During its discussion at the Congress, the Bundists demanded the inclusion in the Party Programme of a special point on the "equality of languages". They succeeded in winning over a section of the vacillating *Iskra* supporters and there was a split when the proposal was put to the vote.

The wording of §7 was again referred to the Programme Committee. Lenin's proposals with slight stylistic changes were adopted by the committee and on its behalf tabled at the 21st sitting of the Congress on August 1 (14). The Congress rejected the first point of the proposals and adopted the second with some amendments (§8 in the Programme adopted by the Congress); point three was adopted without alteration.

Paragraph 11, of which Lenin spoke in point 3 of his proposals, had the following wording in the *Iskra* draft: "Free and compulsory general and vocational education for all children of either sex up to the age of 16. Provision of poor children with food, clothing and study aids at the expense of the state." The Programme Committee initially adopted this paragraph without amendment (§14), but during its discussion at the 18th sitting of the Congress on July 31 (August 13) the following addendum was adopted: "Instruction in the native language, on the demand of the population" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 198). This addendum became superfluous with the adoption of a separate point on the question of language. p. 87

[64] The point at issue is §2 of the section of the draft programme dealing with labour protection, which contained a demand for a statutory weekly period of rest running continuously for at least 36 hours, for wage-workers of either sex in all branches of

the national economy. Lyadov proposed that the period should run for 42 hours; Lieber remarked that the programme said nothing about supervision in small-scale production. Lyadov's proposal was adopted by the Congress, and Lieber's amendment was rejected. p. 88

[65] The point at issue is §12 of the section of the draft programme dealing with labour protection (§11 of the *Iskra* draft), which contained a demand for "supervision by the organs of local self-government, with the participation of workers' delegates, over the sanitary state of the living quarters provided for workers by their employers, and also over the internal regulations on these premises and the terms of their lease, to safeguard wage-workers against intervention by employers in their life and activity as private persons and citizens". Lyadov motioned the following addenda to this paragraph:

1) agrarian inspection to be established for supervision over all agricultural enterprises employing wage labour; 2) points 1-13 of the section of the programme dealing with labour protection to be extended to all agriculture with wage labour; 3) tenants holding land as sharecroppers, or indentured to cultivate the landowner's land, to be regarded as wage-workers falling within the province of the agrarian inspection. The Congress rejected the first two addenda and Lyadov withdrew the third. p. 88

[66] The amendment was motioned by Lenin during the discussion of the preamble of the draft programme on the agrarian question, which said: "For the purpose, however, of eliminating the survivals of the serf system, which are a heavy burden on the peasants, and in the interests of the free development of the class struggle in the countryside, the Party will work for...." The Congress adopted the amendment. p. 88

[67] The point at issue is §1 of the draft programme on the agrarian question, which contained a demand for the "abolition of land redemption and quit-rent payments and all other services now borne by the peasants as a poll-tax paying estate". Lyadov proposed the addition: "or other rural inhabitants, as poll-tax paying estates". The amendment was rejected by the Congress. p. 89

[68] During the debate on §2 of the draft programme on the agrarian question, which spoke of the need to abolish collective liability and all other laws hampering the peasant in his disposal of the land, Martynov asked this question: "How are we to understand the words: 'his land'?" He believed that two interpretations of this point were possible: "1) every peasant has the right of redemption; in that case the interests of the commune are not infringed; 2) every peasant has the right to appropriate the land without redemption." Following Lenin's explanation, Martynov spoke again and said that he was not thinking about particulars but about the general principle: who was the owner of the land—the commune or the peasant? He went on: "If it is the commune then regarding it as a constraint on economic development, we

stand for the right of redemption. If it is the peasant, there is no need for redemption" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 235). p. 89

[69] Paragraph 4 of the draft programme on the agrarian question contained a demand for the "establishment of peasants' committees: a) for the restitution to the village communes (by expropriation or, when the land has changed hands, by redemption by the state at the expense of gentry-owned large landed estates) of the land cut off from the peasants when serfdom was abolished and now used by the landlords as a means of keeping the peasants in bondage, b) for the elimination of the survivals of serf relations, which have been preserved in the Urals, in the Altai, in the Western territory and in other regions of the state...".

N. N. Jordania (Kostrov) motioned the following addendum to this point: "for the transfer into the ownership of the peasants in the Caucasus of the lands of which they have the use as temporarily bound, khizani, etc." (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 243). The second proposal was motioned by B. M. Knunyants (Rusov) and M. N. Lyadov, who believed that it was possible for the programme to confine itself to a general statement of the need for eliminating the survivals of serf relations all over Russia.

The amendment of D. A. Toputidze (Karsky), mentioned by Lenin in his speech, was not entered in the minutes of the Congress.

The Congress adopted Jordania's addendum.

Khizani—the name given to the peasants of Georgia who settled on the lands of the landowners on specially agreed terms. The khizani were not officially regarded as serfs, and enjoyed personal freedom, but remained perpetual tenants without any rights. The 1861 Peasant Reform did not apply to them and they continued to be completely dependent on the landowners, who began to increase khizani services and confiscate the land they held. The khizani system was abolished after the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Temporarily bound peasants—the name given to those former serf peasants who were compelled to perform certain services (quit-rent or corvée) for the use of their land even after the abolition of serfdom in 1861 and until they started paying redemption money to the landowner for their allotments. From the moment the redemption contract was concluded, the peasants ceased to be "temporarily bound" and became "peasant property-owners". p. 90

[70] Paragraph 5 of the draft programme on the agrarian question spoke of the need to empower the courts to reduce excessive rents and declare invalid transactions of an enslaving character. §16 of the section of the draft programme dealing with labour protection contained the demand for the establishment of industrial courts consisting of an equal number of workers' and employers' representatives in every branch of the national economy. p. 90

[71] Lenin's objection is against Lieber's proposal to introduce into §5 of the draft programme on the agrarian question the demand to empower the courts to establish land-lease prices. p. 90

[72] During the debate on the first clause of §4 of the draft Rules—the order governing the appointment of members of the Party Council and the replacement of outgoing Council members—the Rules Committee failed to reach agreement and three formulations were put before the Congress.

The first, motioned by L. Martov and V. A. Noskov (Glebov), said: "The Party Council shall be appointed by the Editorial Board of the Central Organ and the Central Committee, each of whom shall delegate two members to the Council; these four members of the Council shall invite the fifth; outgoing members of the Council shall be replaced by the institutions appointing them."

The second, tabled by V. I. Lenin and V. N. Rozanov (Popov), said: "The Party Council shall be appointed by the Congress from among the members of the Editorial Board of the Central Organ and the Central Committee and shall consist of five persons, with at least two of them from each of these collegiums. The Council itself shall replace the outgoing members of the Council."

The third, motioned by Y. Y. Levin (Yegorov), said: "The Congress shall elect two members of the C.C. and two of the Editorial Board of the Central Organ to the Council of the Party. These four elected members shall unanimously elect the fifth; outgoing members of the Council shall be replaced by the organisations to which they belong, with the exception of the fifth, who shall be replaced in the manner specified above."

As a result of the discussion of this question, the Congress adopted the following formulations:

"4. The Congress shall appoint the fifth member of the Council, the Central Committee and the Editorial Board of the Central Organ.

"5. The Council of the Party shall be appointed by the Editorial Board of the Central Organ and the C.C., each of whom shall delegate two members to the Council; outgoing members of the Council shall be replaced by the institutions appointing them, the fifth shall be replaced by the Council itself" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 426). p. 91

[73] In the discussion of the first clause of §4 of the draft rules, Vera Zasulich said: "The objection that the four members of the Council will be unable to elect the fifth is groundless: if an institution like the Council is unable to elect a fifth member, it means that it is altogether incapable of operating" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 296). p. 91

[74] The point at issue is §10 of the draft Rules, which says: "Every member of the Party and every person having any dealings with the Party shall have the right to demand that his statement, in its original form, is communicated to the Central Committee or to the Editorial Board of the Central Organ, or to the Party congress" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 426). Lenin spoke against Martov's proposal to remove the words "and every person having any dealings with the Party". Martov's proposal was rejected. p. 91

[75] The speech relates to §12 of the draft Party Rules dealing with the co-optation to the Party's collegiate institutions, including the C.C. and the C.O. In his book *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* Lenin wrote: "Greater strictness as regards the majority required for adoption of members (four-fifths instead of two-thirds), the requirement of unanimity for co-optation, mutual control over co-optation to the central bodies—all this we began to advocate *when we found ourselves in the minority on the question of the personal composition of the central bodies*" (see present edition, Vol. 7, p. 296). Martov came out against the proposal that the demand for the unanimity and mutual control of the C.C. and the C.O. in matters of co-optation should be written into the Rules. p. 91

[76] Y. Y. Levin (Yegorov) objected to any qualification (two-thirds or four-fifths) of the majority necessary for co-optation to the Party's collegiate institutions, believing that in the absence of any motivated protest the question could be decided by a simple majority. p. 91

[77] Y. Y. Levin (Yegorov) said in his speech that the draft Rules were "lame" because they contained no point empowering the Party Council to decide on the question of co-optation to the Party central bodies. p. 92

[78] A reference to the speeches of Trotsky and Martov objecting to Lenin's proposal that §12 of the Party Rules should state that the C.C. and the C.O. Editorial Board could co-opt members only with the consent of all the members of the Party Council. p. 92

[79] A reference to Martov's proposal during the debate on §12 of the draft Rules: "In the event no unanimity is reached in co-opting new members to the C.C. or to the Editorial Board of the Central Organ, the question of the member's admission may be referred to the Council, and in the event it annuls the decision of the collegium in question, the latter shall take a final decision by a simple majority" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 311). p. 93

[80] A reference to Martov's words: "I propose that a majority dissatisfied with a minority decision should be entitled to appeal to the Council for a decision" (*Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 311). Martov's amendment was adopted by the Congress by 24 votes to 23. p. 93

[81] *The League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad* was founded in October 1901 on Lenin's initiative. Affiliated to the League were the *Iskra* organisation abroad and the *Sotsial-Demokrat* revolutionary organisation which included the Emancipation of Labour group. The task of the League was to spread the ideas of revolutionary Social-Democracy and to help create a militant Social-Democratic organisation. Under its Rules, the League was the *Iskra* organisation abroad. It recruited *Iskra* supporters from among Russian Social-Democrats abroad, gave *Iskra* material assistance, organised the delivery of the newspaper to Russia and published popular Marxist literature. The Second Congress

of the R.S.D.L.P. confirmed the League as the only Party organisation abroad with the status of a committee, authorising it to work under the guidance and control of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee.

After the Second Congress, the Mensheviks entrenched themselves in the League and launched a struggle against Lenin and the Bolsheviks. At the League's Second Congress in October 1903, the Mensheviks secured the adoption of new Rules aimed against the Party Rules, as approved by the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. From then on the League became a Menshevik stronghold. It operated until 1905. p. 93

[82] In his speech Lenin replies to V. A. Noskov (Glebov) and L. G. Deutsch, who proposed that §13 (on the recognition of the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad as the only R.S.D.L.P. organisation abroad, and on its tasks) should not be included in the Rules, but referred for discussion to the Central Committee (Glebov) or to the Party Council (Deutsch). §13 of the Rules was adopted by 31 votes to 12, with 6 abstentions. p. 93

[83] Following the approval by the Congress of §13 of the Rules, recognising the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad as the R.S.D.L.P. only organisation abroad, delegates of the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, Martynov and Akimov, informed the Bureau of the Congress that they would not take part in the voting and would attend the Congress only to hear the minutes of earlier sittings and to discuss the manner of their publication. Their statement was read out at the 27th sitting of the Congress on August 5 (18). The Congress invited Akimov and Martynov to withdraw their statement, but they rejected the proposal and walked out.

Lenin did not move the draft resolution at the Congress. In the original the draft is crossed out. The reason may have been that the Bureau of the Congress had decided to refer the question for discussion at the Congress. p. 93

[84] *The Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad* was founded in 1894 on the initiative of the Emancipation of Labour group, on the understanding that all its members accept the programme of the group.

The First Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. recognised the Union as the Party's representative abroad. Subsequently opportunist elements—Economists (the so-called "young")—gained the upper hand in the Union. The opportunist majority of the First Congress of the Union of Russian Social-Democrats Abroad, held at Zurich in November 1898, refuged to voice solidarity with the Manifesto of the First Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. In view of this, the Emancipation of Labour group announced at the Congress its refusal to edit publications of the Union, with the exception of No. 5-6 of *Rabotnik* which had been prepared for the press, and Lenin's pamphlets, *The Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats* and *The New*

Factory Law. In April 1899, the Union started to publish the magazine *Rabocheye Dyelo* on whose Editorial Board were the Economists B. N. Krichevsky, V. P. Ivanshin and P. F. Teplov. The Union voiced its sympathy with E. Bernstein, the Millerandists, etc.

The struggle within the Union continued until its Second Congress in April 1900 and at the Congress. The Emancipation of Labour group and its followers walked out from the Congress and formed an independent organisation called *Sotsial-Demokrat*.

At the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., representatives of the Union (*Rabocheye Dyelo* supporters) adopted an extremely opportunist stand and walked out when the Congress recognised the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad as the Party's only organisation abroad. The Union was dissolved by a decision of the Second Congress (see *Vtoroi syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, 1959, p. 438). p. 94

[85] A reference to the *Iskra* majority, which took final shape at the Congress by the time of the election to the C.C., when the "soft" *Iskra* followers had split away and the Bund delegates and the two *Rabocheye Dyelo* supporters walked out. p. 95

[86] B. M. Knunyants (Rusov) motioned a proposal to start elections to the Party Central Committee. p. 95

[87] The Congress adopted two resolutions on the question of the attitude to the liberals: the first was motioned by Potresov (Starover), the second, by Lenin, Plekhanov and 13 other delegates (for Plekhanov's draft with Lenin's amendment see *Lenin Miscellany VI*, pp. 177-78).

Lenin subsequently wrote: "The views of the old *Iskra* were much better expressed in Plekhanov's resolution, which emphasised the anti-revolutionary and anti-proletarian character of the liberal *Osvobozhdeniye*, than in the confused resolution tabled by Starover, which, on the one hand, aimed (quite inopportunely) at an 'agreement' with the liberals, and, on the other, stipulated for it conditions that were manifestly unreal, being altogether impossible for the liberals to fulfil" (see present edition, Vol. 7, p. 498). p. 96

[88] *Osvobozhdeniye* (Emancipation)—a fortnightly journal published abroad from June 18 (July 1), 1902 to October 5 (18), 1905, under the editorship of P. B. Struve. It was the organ of the Russian liberal bourgeoisie and expounded the ideas of moderate-monarchist liberalism. In 1903 the *Osvobozhdeniye* League formed round the journal (officially it came into existence in January 1904). The League existed until October 1905. The followers of *Osvobozhdeniye* and the Zemstvo constitutionalists made up the core of the Constitutional-Democratic (Cadet) Party—the principal bourgeois party in Russia, which was formed in October 1905. p. 96

[89] *The State Council*—one of the higher state bodies in pre-revolutionary Russia. Set up in 1810 on a proposal by M. M. Speransky as a consultative and legislative institution whose members were

appointed and confirmed by the tsar. It was reorganised by the law of February 20 (March 5), 1906, and was given the right to approve or reject bills after the debate in the Duma, but the tsar retained the power to amend the fundamental laws and issue some of the more important ones.

From 1906, one half of the State Council consisted of elected representatives of the gentry, the clergy and the big bourgeoisie, and the other from the senior civil servants appointed by the tsar. This made it a highly reactionary institution which rejected even the moderate bills adopted by the Duma. p. 98

[90] *The Second Congress of the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad* was held at Geneva from October 13 to 18 (26-31), 1903. It was called at the insistence of the Mensheviks who wanted to oppose it to the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. Lenin objected to its convocation and wrote: "A League Congress *now* will generate more heat than light, i.e., it will contribute nothing to the work abroad" (see present edition, Vol. 34, p. 176).

The congress of the League was attended by 15 supporters of the majority led by Lenin (14 from the second sitting), who had 18 votes, and by 18 Mensheviks (19 from the second sitting) with 22 votes. The congress discussed the following questions: 1) report by the administration of the League Abroad; 2) report by the League's delegate at the Second Party Congress; 3) the League's Rules; 4) elections of the administration.

The central question of the agenda was a report by Lenin, who had been the League's delegate at the Party Congress. He described the work of the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. and exposed the opportunism of the Mensheviks, showing their unprincipled behaviour at the Congress. (For Lenin's report and speeches see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 69-85.) Taking advantage of their majority at the League congress, the opposition decided to have Martov as a co-rapporteur. Martov spoke out in defence of the Mensheviks' behaviour at the R.S.D.L.P. Second Congress and made slanderous accusations against the Bolsheviks. Realising that it was futile and impossible to continue the polemic against the opposition, Lenin and the supporters of the majority left the congress and refused to take part in any further debates on this question. The Menshevik majority at the congress, in an effort to secure the Party's central bodies, adopted three resolutions on the second item of the agenda, in which it opposed Lenin's approach to organisational questions and called for sustained struggle against the Bolsheviks.

The congress also adopted the League's Rules, some of which were aimed against the Party Rules (such as publication of general Party literature under the League's auspices, relations between the League's administration and other organisations, bypassing the C.C. and the C.O.); the Mensheviks also contested the right of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee to approve the League's Rules. F. V. Lengnik, the representative of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee who attended the congress, demanded on behalf of the Central Committee that the League's Rules should be brought

into line with the Party Rules, and when the opposition refused to do so, declared the assembly invalid and walked out. The Party Council approved of his action (see p. 107 of this volume).

Lenin said that the congress of the League was the "climax of the opposition's campaign against the central bodies" (see present edition, Vol. 7, p. 122). After the League's Second-Congress, the Mensheviks turned it into a stronghold in their fight against the Party.

The "Preparatory Material" section in Vol. 41 of the Fifth Russian edition of Lenin's *Collected Works* contains two relevant documents: an outline-plan of Lenin's report on the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. at the League congress, and Lenin's notes at the first sitting of the League congress. p. 104

[91] This is in reply to L. G. Deutsch's proposal on item 3 of the agenda substitute "amendment of the Rules" for "working out the Rules". The working out of a *new* set of rules for the League was a question of principle. The League's old Rules (1901), drawn up at a time when the Party was not yet a single whole, no longer met the new demands. The Party Rules adopted at the Second R.S.D.L.P. Congress gave the League the same rights as the Party committees, with the exception, however, that it could support the Russian revolutionary movement only through persons and groups specially appointed by the Central Committee (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK*, Part I, 1954, p. 47). In his consistent efforts to have the decisions of the Second R.S.D.L.P. Congress implemented, Lenin demanded the working out of a new set of rules for the League in accordance with the Party Rules. p. 104

[92] A reference to L. Martov's proposal that he should be allowed to give a co-report on the Party's Second Congress. p. 105

[93] L. Martov's pamphlet, *The Struggle Against the "State of Siege" in the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party*, was issued at Geneva in 1904. p. 106

[94] A reference to Trotsky's efforts, with the aid of various sophisms and arbitrary interpretations of the Party Rules, to show that the League Abroad was empowered to approve the draft of the League's Rules the congress was debating, independently of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee. p. 106

[95] A reference to §6 of the R.S.D.L.P. Rules adopted by the Party's Second Congress (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsii i plenumov TsK*, Part I, 1954, p. 46). p. 106

[96] The resolution motioned by L. Y. Galperin (Konyagin), which the Bolsheviks supported, said that the League Rules would enter into force upon their approval by the Central Committee. This resolution was drawn up in accordance with the R.S.D.L.P. Rules and safeguarded the principles of democratic centralism in the Party.

Martov's resolution, adopted by the opportunist majority of the League congress, was based on the assumption that the League had the right to adopt its own Rules without preliminary approval by the Party Central Committee. p. 107

[97] A reference to F. V. Lengnik. See Note 90. p. 107

[98] *The R.S.D.L.P. Council*, which met at Geneva from January 15 (28) to 17 (30), 1904, was "called on the initiative of the C.O. representatives for the purpose of discussing measures to co-ordinate the activity of the C.C. and the C.O. in the publication of Party literature" (*Lenin Miscellany X*, p. 181—minutes of the Council's sittings). The Council's sittings were attended by V. I. Lenin, F. V. Lengnik, G. V. Plekhanov, P. B. Axelrod and L. Martov.

On a motion by Lenin, the Party Council decided to include in the agenda and to discuss first the question of measures to restore peace in the Party. On behalf of the Central Committee, Lenin motioned a draft resolution on the question on January 15 (28) (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 145-47). When the debate showed the Mensheviks' negative attitude to the resolution, Lenin and Lengnik motioned another draft resolution on restoring peace in the Party on January 16 (29) (see p. 109), which was adopted by the Council by three votes (Lenin, Lengnik and Plekhanov) to two (Martov and Axelrod). But instead of proceeding to a concrete discussion of the question of restoring peace in the Party, the Council, over Lenin's protest, went to vote Plekhanov's resolution demanding the co-optation of the Mensheviks to the Central Committee. The resolution was adopted by the votes of Plekhanov, Martov and Axelrod. Accordingly, the C.C. representatives (Lenin and Lengnik) entered a minority opinion on January 17 (30) censuring Plekhanov's resolution which ignored the will of the majority at the Party's Second Congress. The minority opinion was written by Lenin (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 148-51).

When the Mensheviks had frustrated every effort to establish peace in the Party, Lenin motioned a draft resolution on the convocation of the Party's Third Congress as the only way out of the situation (see present edition, Vol. 7, p. 152). By the votes of Plekhanov, Martov and Axelrod, this resolution was rejected and one by Martov against the convocation of the Party congress adopted.

Nor was any agreement reached between the representatives of the C.C. and the Mensheviks on the publication of Party literature. The Party Council rejected the resolutions on this question motioned by Lenin and adopted the resolutions approving of the factional and disorganising activity of the Editorial Board of the Menshevik *Iskra*.

The Council's January sitting showed that with Plekhanov's switch to the Mensheviks' side, the R.S.D.L.P. Council became an instrument in the Menshevik fight against the Party. p. 108

[99] A reference to the draft resolution on measures to restore peace in the Party. Lenin insisted that his resolution should be put

to the vote before Plekhanov's, who was proposing the co-optation of Mensheviks to the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee. p. 108

[100] A reference to Martov's speech on the voting of the resolutions motioned by Lenin and by Plekhanov. While admitting that Lenin had the legitimate right to demand that his resolution should be voted on first, Martov nevertheless proposed the following change in the approach to the question: 1) Is it necessary to issue a call to all the members of the Party? 2) Plekhanov's concrete proposal. p. 108

[101] Martov's resolution was aimed against the minority opinion entered on January 17 (30), 1904, by the C.C. representatives Lenin and Lengnik over the Party Council's resolution motioned by Plekhanov on the co-optation of Mensheviks to the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 148-51). In his resolution Martov proposed that Lenin and Lengnik should be censured for entering their minority opinion. In the course of the debate that followed, Martov was forced to withdraw his resolution and to adhere to Plekhanov's resolution, which was somewhat different in form, and which was adopted by the Menshevik votes. p. 110

[102] This was written by Lenin in connection with the decision by the "Group of Founders" to set up a library and archives of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee at Geneva. Together with the appeal of the "Group of Founders" for assistance in organising the Party library and archives, it was published in a leaflet "To One and All" (put out by the Party printing-press in Geneva).

On February 7 (20), 1904, Lenin, as a member of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee, signed the "Regulations of the Library and Archives of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee" (the document is written in V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich's hand).

Later Lenin wrote the "Statement by the Group of Founders of the R.S.D.L.P. Library at Geneva" on the transfer of the R.S.D.L.P. library to the Majority Committees' Bureau (see p. 136). The next sitting of the M.C.B., on Lenin's motion, confirmed the members of the earlier "Group of Founders" as the supervisory committee of the library and archives of the R.S.D.L.P. A report on this committee's activity was submitted to the Party Congress (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P. Protokoly*, Moscow, 1959, pp. 533-37). The library was in existence for 13 years, until the February 1917 revolution. At present, the collections of the library and the archives of the R.S.D.L.P. are at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee. p. 111

[103] This was written by Lenin a week after the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War and was circulated to the Party committees in a number of cities in Russia with instructions to have it immediately reprinted and spread. N. K. Krupskaya informed I. Kh. Lalayants, L. B. Krasin and L. M. Knipovich about the dispatch of the leaflet in her letters on February 3 (16) and 4 (17), 1904 (Archives of the

Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee and *Lenin Miscellany X*, pp. 323, 324). On February 16 (29), 1904, she wrote to R. S. Zemlyachka and L. Y. Galperin: "Starik (V. I. Lenin.—*Ed.*) has written a leaflet about the war; it was not distributed here, and was sent for reprinting in Tomsk, Moscow, Odessa, St. Petersburg, Samara, Saratov, Nizhny Novgorod and Yekaterinoslav" (Central State Historical Archives in Moscow). At the library of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism there are many copies of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee's leaflet "To the Russian Proletariat": there are copies bearing the seal of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee, the seals of the Moscow and Yekaterinoslav committees of the R.S.D.L.P.; the leaflet was reprinted and distributed by the Nizhny Novgorod (7,700 copies), Tver and Saratov committees, and by students in Kiev. In addition, it was reprinted in *Iskra* No. 61 on March 5 (18), 1904. p. 111

[104] Following the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95), the 1895 Treaty of Shimonoseki forced China to cede the Liaotung Peninsula and the islands of Penghuletao (Pescadores) and Taiwan to Japan, to undertake to pay an indemnity of 200 million liang (subsequently increased to 230 million liang) and to grant Japan a number of economic privileges. Fearful of Japan's growing strength, Russia, France and Germany issued a protest over the Treaty of Shimonoseki and this forced Japan to abandon the idea of annexing the Liaotung Peninsula. p. 113

[105] These outlines were the basis of a report on the Paris Commune given by Lenin at Geneva on March 9 (22), 1904. They were written after a thorough study of Karl Marx's *The Civil War in France* (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 473-545). All of Lenin's references are to the Berlin edition of 1891. He also makes use of Lissagaray's *History of the Commune of 1871* and Weill's *History of the Social Movement in France* (*1852-1902*).

On the basis of these outlines Lenin wrote a "Plan of a Lecture on the Commune" in 1905 (see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 206-08). Here turned again and again to the Paris Commune (see, for instance, the articles "Lessons of the Commune" and "In Memory of the Commune", and Chapter III of the book *The State and Revolution*—present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 475-78, Vol. 17, pp. 139-43, Vol. 25, pp. 418-37). p. 113

[106] Engels's "Introduction to Marx's *The Civil War in France*" (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, p. 475). p. 114

[107] *I.A.A.* (*Internationale Arbeiter Association*)—the International Working Men's Association (First International)—the first international mass organisation of the proletariat set up at an international workers' meeting in London called by British and French workers in 1864. Karl Marx was the organiser and leader of the First International, and wrote its Inaugural Address, Rules and other programme and tactical documents. The establishment of the First International was the result of long and persistent efforts

by Marx and Engels to organise a working-class revolutionary party, Lenin said that the First International "laid the foundation of an international organisation of the workers for the preparation of their revolutionary attack on capital" and "laid the foundation of the proletarian international struggle for socialism" (see present edition, Vol. 29, pp. 306, 307).

The central governing body of the First International was its General Council, of which Karl Marx was a member throughout. He did a great deal to overcome the petty-bourgeois influences and sectarian tendencies which then prevailed in the labour movement (trade unionism in Britain, Proudhonism and anarchism in Romance countries and Lassalleanism in Germany) and rallied the advanced workers in Europe and America round the principles of scientific socialism. The First International directed the economic and political struggle of workers in various countries and strengthened their international solidarity. It also played a great part in spreading Marxism and introducing socialism into the working-class movement.

After the defeat of the Paris Commune, the working class was faced with the task of setting up mass national parties on the basis of the principles put forward by the First International. In 1873 Marx wrote: "As I view European conditions it is quite useful to let the formal organisation of the International recede into the background for the time being" (see Marx's letter to F. A. Sorge, September 27, 1873) (Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 286). The First International was officially dissolved at the Philadelphia Conference in 1876. p. 114

[108] The world industrial exposition where a delegation of French workers met British workers. p. 114

[109] *Proudhonism*—an unscientific, anti-Marxist trend of petty-bourgeois socialism named after the French anarchist Proudhon. Marx and Engels waged a consistent struggle against Proudhon's attempts to impose his views on the First International. Proudhonism was subjected to withering criticism by Marx in *The Poverty of Philosophy*. The resolute struggle conducted by Marx, Engels and their supporters against Proudhonism within the First International ended in the full triumph of Marxism over Proudhonism.

Lenin said Proudhonism was the "stupidity of the petty bourgeois and the philistine", incapable of accepting the working-class standpoint. Proudhonist ideas have been widely used by bourgeois "theorists" to advocate class collaboration. p. 114

[110] *Blanquism*—a trend in the French socialist movement led by the outstanding revolutionary and prominent French utopian Communist, Louis Auguste Blanqui (1805-1881).

Lenin wrote that the Blanquists hoped "that mankind will be emancipated from wage slavery, not by the proletarian class struggle, but through a conspiracy hatched by a small minority of intellectuals" (see present edition, Vol. 10, p. 392). They substituted action by a secret group of plotters for the activity of a revolutionary party, failed to take account of the concrete situa-

tion in which an uprising could be victorious, and neglected to maintain ties with the masses. p. 114

[111] Engels's "Introduction to Marx's *Civil War in France*" (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 475-76). p. 114

[112] *La débâcle* (1892)—Émile Zola's novel describing the Franco-Prussian War. p. 115

[113] A reference to the manifesto issued by the Central Committee of the Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany on September 5, 1870. p. 115

[114] Marx, "Second Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association on the Franco-Prussian War" (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 491-98). p. 115

[115] Marx, *The Civil War in France* (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 473-545). p. 115

[116] Alphonse-Simon Guiod, commander of the Paris army artillery, wrote to artillery division General Susane that he could take his protégé on his staff where he would be bored by the inaction, or he could send him to Mont Valérien where only a pretence was made of firing off the guns. This letter, published by the Commune in No. 115 of *Journal Officiel de la République Française* (Official Journal of the French Republic) on April 25, 1871, showed that the "government of national defence" merely pretended that it was defending Paris. Also see Marx, *The Civil War in France* (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 500-01). p. 115

[117] A reference to Leo Frankel, a jeweller, who was one of the leaders of the German workers' alliance in France, a prominent leader of the Hungarian and international working-class movement and the founder of the first Hungarian Socialist Labour Party. p. 117

[118] The expression "ticket-of-leave men" was used by Marx in *The Civil War in France* where he says the following about Thiers' ministers: "These men, then, could find, in the ruins of Paris only, their tickets-of-leave: they were the very men Bismarck wanted.... In England common criminals are often discharged on parole after serving the greater part of their term, and are placed under police surveillance. On such discharge they receive a certificate called ticket-of-leave, their possessors being referred to as ticket-of-leave men" (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, p. 502). p. 121

[119] *The letters of Dupont*, corresponding secretary of the General Council of the First International, are given in Weill's *History of the Social Movement in France* (*1852-1902*). In his "Plan of a Lecture on the Commune" Lenin mentions Dupont's letter of September 7, 1870 (see present edition, Vol. 8, p. 207) p. 121

[120] The figures on the number of Communards convicted by courts are taken from Lissagaray's *History of the Commune of 1871*. p. 122

[121] *The R.S.D.L.P. Council* met at Geneva on May 31 and June 5 (June 13 and 18), 1904, with V. I. Lenin, G. V. Plekhanov (Chairman), Y. A. Noskov, P. B. Axelrod and L. Martov present. At its first sitting it discussed the questions of calling an inter-party conference of revolutionary and opposition organisations of Russia, and of the forthcoming international congress at Amsterdam. The second sitting was devoted to a discussion of internal Party questions: 1) the right of the Party's central bodies (C.C. and C.O.) to recall their representatives from the Party Council; 2) co-optation to the committees and the Central Committee's right to seat new members on them; 3) procedure governing the voting by Party organisations on the convocation of the Party's Third Congress; 4) publication of the minutes of Council sittings, etc.

In view of the fact that three of the five Council members (Plekhanov, Axelrod and Martov) represented the Menshevik opposition, while Noskov took a conciliatory stand, the Party Council adopted Menshevik decisions on the most important internal Party matters (for Lenin's speeches at the R.S.D.L.P. Council see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 433-42). p. 122

[122] *The Inter-Party Conference of Opposition and Revolutionary Organisations of Russia*, called on the initiative of the Finnish Party of Active Resistance, was held at the end of 1904. The representatives of the R.S.D.L.P. and several other Social-Democratic parties and organisations of Russia met at Amsterdam in August 1904, before the International Socialist Congress opened, and decided not to attend the inter-Party conference. For the R.S.D.L.P., this decision was approved by the Party Council sitting on August 21 (September 3), 1904. p. 122

[123] *The Latvian Social-Democratic Labour Organisation of the Baltic Area* was set up in April 1902 through the merger of several Social-Democratic organisations. On its basis, the First Congress of Latvian Social-Democratic Organisations, held from June 7 to 9 (20-22), 1904, set up the Latvian Social-Democratic Labour Party which joined the R.S.D.L.P. at the Fourth (Unity) Congress in 1906.

The Latvian Social-Democratic Union, set up in the autumn of 1900 abroad, was akin in its demands to the Russian Socialist-Revolutionaries and was largely permeated with nationalistic tendencies. In 1905, the Union gained some temporary influence among a section of the peasants, but was soon ousted by the Latvian Social-Democratic Labour Party. The Union subsequently played no noticeable role of any kind. p. 122

[124] A reference to the *Armenian Social-Democratic Labour Organisation* (Specifics), which was set up by Armenian national-federalist elements soon after the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. Like the Bundists, the Specifics wanted the Party organised on the

federal principle, which implied a division of the proletariat on national lines, and declared themselves to be the sole representatives of the Armenian proletariat. They tried to justify their nationalism by referring to the "specific conditions of each nation". In a letter to the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee over the conference of Social-Democratic organisations in Russia called for September 1905, Lenin wrote: "I strongly warn you against the Armenian Social-Democratic Federation. If you have agreed to its participation in the conference, you have made a *fatal* mistake, which must be rectified *at all costs*. It is represented in Geneva by a couple of disrupters who publish sheer trivia here and have no *serious* connections with the Caucasus. It is a *Bund creatura*, nothing more, specially invented to cultivate Caucasian Bundism.... All the Caucasian comrades are against this gang of disruptive writers..." (see present edition, Vol. 34, p. 337). p. 122

[125] A reference to Martov's proposal at the first sitting of the Party Council calling for the adoption of a resolution to have all decisions involving principle, at the inter-party conference, adopted only unanimously. p. 122

[126] A remark Lenin made in connection with Martov's resolution inviting all Party organisations to send to the Party Council their mandates for the Amsterdam Congress of the Second International, and also to submit reports on local activity for the drawing up of a general report. Martov was followed by Plekhanov who said there was no time to wait for local reports and proposed that someone should be asked to draw up a report right away. p. 123

[127] A reference to the newspaper *Veratsnutyun* (Renascence), organ of the Gnchak, the Armenian petty-bourgeois nationalist party. It was published in Rusčuk, Bulgaria, in 1903 and 1904. p. 124

[128] A reference to Martov's assertion that the minority of the Moscow Committee had proposed the co-optation not of one but of two of their members. p. 124

[129] Under the Party Rules adopted by the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., only those organisations which had been confirmed not less than a year before the congress enjoyed the right of representation on it. On the strength of this, V. A. Noskov (Glebov) said at the second sitting of the Party Council that the votes of the Tver and Riga committees were invalid in deciding on the convocation of the Party's Third Congress. p. 125

[130] *The Caucasian League of the R.S.D.L.P.* was set up at the First Congress of Caucasian Social-Democratic Organisations at Tiflis in March 1903, on the initiative of the Tiflis and the Baku committees of the R.S.D.L.P. It was attended by 15 delegates from the Tiflis, Baku, Batum, Kutais and other Social-Democratic organisations in Transcaucasia. It elected the League's 9-man governing body, the Caucasian Union Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., and approved the political line of the Leninist *Iskra*; it adopted as

a basis for activity by Social-Democratic organisations in Transcaucasia the draft Party programme worked out by *Iskra* and *Zarya*.

At the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., there were three delegates from the Caucasian League, who had been instructed to defend the programme, organisational and tactical principles of the Leninist *Iskra*. From the outset, the Caucasian Union Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. established close ties with Lenin and provided firm support for the Bolsheviks in their struggle against the Menshevik opposition. The League took an active part in preparing the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., and its representatives were on the Majority Committees' Bureau, which made the practical preparations for the Third Congress. The League played an important part in organising the labour movement in Transcaucasia before and during the first revolution in Russia. It did a great service in educating the workers of the multi-national Caucasus in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. In February 1906, the League was dissolved in view of the establishment of united committees of the Bolshevik and the Menshevik factions. p. 125

[131] A reference to Martov's proposal at the second sitting of the Party Council to give the Samara, Smolensk, Bryansk and Astrakhan committees the same status as that accorded to those which had attended the Congress, that is, the right to vote in deciding on the convocation of a Party congress. p. 125

[132] Martov proposed that the Caucasian League should be given the right to vote for a congress, as of September 1903, when its Rules had been approved. p. 126

[133] A reference to the decision taken by the January 1904 sitting of the Party Council to publish the Council's minutes. p. 126

[134] On June 5 (18), 1904, the Party Council—by the votes of the Mensheviks G. V. Plekhanov, L. Martov and P. B. Axelrod, and the conciliator V. A. Noskov (Glebov)—decided against publishing the Council's minutes. p. 127

[135] A reference to the appeal "To the Party", adopted by a conference of 22 Bolsheviks and published as a separate leaflet by the Riga Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. in August 1904 (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 452-59). p. 127

[136] A reference to the *Central Committee's* "*July Declaration*", a resolution adopted by the conciliator members of the Central Committee—L. B. Krasin, V. A. Noskov and L. Y. Galperin—in July 1904. It consisted of 26 points, nine of which were published in *Iskra* No. 72 of August 25 (September 7), 1904, under the title "Declaration of the Central Committee". The resolution was adopted illegally, without the knowledge of two C.C. members: V. I. Lenin, who was in Switzerland, and R. S. Zemlyachka. They were thereby deprived of the possibility of standing up for the Party majority's view in the Central Committee. In this reso-

lution, the conciliators voiced their recognition of the Menshevik Editorial Board of the new *Iskra*, whom Plekhanov had co-opted. Three more conciliators were co-opted to the Central Commlttee: A. I. Lyubimov, L. Y. Karpov, and I. F. Dubrovinsky. The conciliators came out against convening the Third Party Congress and dissolved the Central Committee's Southern Bureau, which had been campaigning for the Congress. They stripped Lenin of his rights as the Party Central Committee representative abroad, and prohibited the publication of his works without the permission of the C.C. collegium. The adoption of the "July Declaration" marked a complete betrayal of the decisions of the Second R.S.D.L.P. Congress by the conciliator members of the Central Committee and their open switch to the Menshevik side.

Lenin issued a sharp protest against the "July Declaration". In his letter "To Five Members of the Central Committee" and his pamphlet *Statement and Documents on the Break of the Central Institutions with the Party*, Lenin esposed the illegal acts of the three members of the Central Committee (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 460-61, 527-33). Lenin was supported by the Party's local committees—St. Petersburg, Moscow, Riga, Baku, Tiflis, Imeretia and Mingrelia, Nikolayev, Odessa, and Yekaterinoslav—which resolutely condemned the "July Declaration". p. 128

[137] A reference to the Menshevik *Iskra*. The Editorial Board of the Party's Central Organ, consisting of V. I. Lenin, G. V. Plekhanov and L. Martov, was approved at the Second Party Congress. But contrary to the Congress decision, the Menshevik Martov refused to sit on the Board without the old Menshevik editors (P. B. Axelrod, A. N. Potresov and V. I. Zasulich), who had not been elected by the Second Congress; so *Iskra*'s Nos. 46 to 51 came out under the editorship of Lenin and Plekhanov. The latter subsequently switched to the Menshevik stand and demanded the inclusion on the Board of the old Menshevik editors who had been rejected by the Congress. Lenin could not accept this and withdrew from the *Iskra* Editorial Board on October 19 (November 1), 1903; he was co-opted to the Central Committee and from there started a struggle against the Menshevik opportunists. *Iskra*'s No. 52 was issued under the editorship of Plekhanov alone, and on November 13 (26), 1903, Plekhanov rode roughshod over the will of the Second Congress by co-opting Axelrod, Potresov and Zasulich. From its No. 52, *Iskra* ceased to be a militant organ of the revolutionary Marxists. The Mensheviks turned it into an organ for fighting Marxism and the Party, and a mouthpiece of opportunism. p. 128

[138] *The Bonch-Bruyevich and Lenin Publishing House of Social-Democratic Party Literature* was set up by the Bolsheviks at the end of the summer of 1904, when *Iskra*'s Menshevik Board refused to publish statements by Party organisations and members in support of the decisions of the Second Party Congress and in favour of convening the Third Party Congress. The Publishers were given assistance by local Majority Committees. p. 128

[139] There is no information about Lenin's having either written the work or given a lecture on the subject. The date has been approximated from the fact that the MS. is on the reverse of the MS. of Lenin's remarks to Rosa Luxemburg's article "The Organisational Questions of Russian Social-Democracy", which was published in No. 69 of *Iskra* on July 10, 1904.

The material on the study of the works by authors whom Lenin mentions in the two plans is published in *Lenin Miscellany XXXII*. This material was also used by Lenin for his lectures on "Marxist Views of the Agrarian Question in Europe and Russia", which he gave at the Russian Higher School of Social Sciences in Paris from February 10 to 13 (23 to 26), 1903 (see *Lenin Miscellany XIX*, pp. 225-48). p. 129

[140] Engels criticised the agrarian programmes of the French and German Social-Democratic parties in his work *The Peasant Question in France and Germany* (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, Moscow, 1962, pp. 420-40). p. 130

[141] In the autumn of 1904, the Geneva group of Bolsheviks set up, on Lenin's initiative, a propagandists' circle which was largely made up of grass-root Party workers—working-men and young people without theoretical knowledge. The aim was to train men for work in Russia, and the studies were in the form of reports and lectures. Lenin was the head of the circle, and conducted the studies on the Party Programme. Classes were soon stopped when some of the comrades went back to Russia in view of the outbreak of the revolution. A number of documents characterising the work of the circle are at the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin's notes, plans of talks and records of the debates on the lectures are published in *Lenin Miscellany XV*, pp. 283-85, 287. p. 131

[142] The meeting was held in the port of London on August 14, 1889, in connection with the start of the dock-workers' strike for higher per-hour wages and at least four hours of work a day. Ten thousand workers (including some unemployed) were involved in the strike. They set up a strike committee, whose secretary was Eleanor Marx-Aveling, Karl Marx's daughter. The strikers had the support of workers in Britain, Australia and a number of European ports. During the strike, the first dock-workers' union was set up, with branches in all the major British ports. The strike continued for five weeks and ended when all the workers' demands were met. It gave an impetus to the development of trade unions and was a turning-point in the British labour movement. p. 132

[143] This is the initial variant and the final text of the "Note by the *Vperyod* Editorial Board to the Letter of Their St. Petersburg Correspondent", which has not been found. It was apparently to have gone into the newspaper's issue No. 4 or No. 5, but the January 9, 1905 events must have crowded out the other reports, and then the letter was too old to print.

Vperyod—an illegal Bolshevik weekly, published in Geneva from December 22, 1904 (January 4, 1905) to May 5 (18), 1905 Eighteen issues appeared, with the printing of 7,000 to 10,000 copies. It was organised and run by Lenin, who had also proposed the newspaper's name. On its Editorial Board were V. V. Vorovsky, M. S. Olminsky and A. V. Lunacharsky. The paper's correspondence with local committees in Russia and its reporters was handled by N. K. Krupskaya. Lenin defined the content of the paper as follows: "The line of *Vperyod* is *the line of the old* '*Iskra*'. In the name of the old *Iskra*, *Vperyod* resolutely combats the new *Iskra*" (see present edition, Vol. 8, p. 130). Lenin not only wrote the leading articles but also a great number of notes, and edited many reports. He wrote some of the articles together with other members of the Board (Vorovsky, Olminsky and others). The MS.s of various authors which have been preserved show the heavy editing and extensive insertions made by Lenin, who always read the page proofs. Even when he was engrossed in the work of the Third Congress in London, he found the time to read the page proofs of No. 17. Issue No. 18 appears not to have been read by him in view of his departure from London to Geneva. More than 60 articles and notes by Lenin were carried in *Vperyod*, and some of its issues—such as Nos. 4 and 5, dealing with the January 9 events and the start of the revolution in Russia—were almost entirely done up by Lenin

The Third Congress passed a special resolution with a vote of thanks, noting the outstanding part played by *Vperyod* in the struggle against the Mensheviks, for the restoration of the Party principle, in the raising and elucidating of the tactical questions brought out by the revolutionary movement, and in the struggle for the convocation of the Congress. Under a decision of the Third Congress, *Proletary* was published as the Central Organ of the Party and a direct successor of *Vperyod*. p. 133

[144] This was written some time in January 1905 as a proposed reply to Plekhanov's article "On Our Tactics Towards the Struggle of the Liberal Bourgeoisie Against Tsarism", which criticised Lenin's pamphlet *The Zemstvo Campaign and Iskra's Plan*. Lenin's article did not appear in the press, and does not seem to have been written. p. 134

[145] In his article "On Our Tactics Towards the Struggle of the Liberal Bourgeoisie Against Tsarism", Plekhanov alleged there was a contradiction between Lenin's old (*What Is To Be Done?*) and his new (*The Zemstvo Campaign and Iskra's Plan*) attitude to the Zemstvo liberal movement. p. 135

[146] A reference to the acts of the Chairman of the Zemstvo Assembly in Tambov Gubernia, who on December 14 and 15, 1904, requested police protection for his Assembly against the "public". Plekhanov's "On Our Tactics Towards the Struggle of the Liberal Bourgeoisie Against Tsarism" says: "By the way, about the panic. The recent Tambov events may perhaps put some

of the opponents of absolutism in mind of the idea that *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* was quite right in threatening the liberals with a popular uprising *against* constitutionalism" (G. V. Plekhanov, *Works*, Vol. XIII, p. 178). p. 135

[147] *The Majority Committees' Bureau* (*M.C.B.*)—the Bolsheviks' organisational centre for preparing the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., set up on Lenin's initiative at the end of 1904. In that period, the Party was in a profound crisis. The Mensheviks had seized the Party centres and were engaged in disorganising and splitting the Party organisations in the localities, and disrupting the unity of working-class action. Meanwhile, the revolutionary situation in the country demanded cohesion of the Party's forces and militant unity of the proletariat. This dictated the need for an early convocation of the Third Party Congress, which was frustrated in every possible way by the central bodies, which were in the hands of the Mensheviks. Under Lenin's leadership, the Bolsheviks launched a campaign for convening the Congress. A great part was played by the conference of 22 Bolsheviks called on Lenin's initiative in Geneva in August 1904. It adopted an appeal "To the Party", written by Lenin, which became a programme for Bolshevik struggle for the convocation of the Third Congress. Three regional conferences of Bolshevik committees—Southern, Caucasian and Northern—were held in Russia from September to December 1904. They set up the Majority Committees' Bureau, which included V. I. Lenin, R. S. Zemlyachka, S. I. Gusev, M. N. Lyadov and M. M. Litvinov. Guided by Lenin, the M.C.B. carried out the practical work in preparing the Third R.S.D.L.P. Congress. p. 136

[148] The article was not written. p. 137

[149] *Narodnoye Pravo* (People's Right)—an illegal party of Russian democratic-minded intellectuals, founded in the summer of 1893 with the participation of former members of the Narodnaya Volya, 0. V. Aptekman, A. I. Bogdanovich, A. V. Gedeonovsky, M. A. Natanson, N. S. Tyutchev and others. Members of the Narodnoye Pravo Party set themselves the task of uniting all opposition forces to fight for political reform. The party put out two programme documents: "Manifesto" and "Vital Question". In the spring of 1894 it was broken up by the tsarist government. Lenin gave an assessment of the Narodnoye Pravo Party as a political organisation in his *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* and *The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democrats* (see present edition, Vol. 1, pp. 129-332 and Vol. 2, pp. 323-51). Most of the members of the Narodnoye Pravo Party subsequently joined the Socialist-Revolutionaries. p. 137

[150] This plan is close in content to Lenin's article "A Militant Agreement for the Uprising" (see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 158-66) and was apparently written after the article, because it raises the question of a combat committee, which the article does not. p. 138

[151] *The Geneva Party Majority Club* was formed at a conference of R.S.D.L.P. promotion groups abroad on January 13, 1905, and had four sections for elaborating questions of Party life: 1) organisation, 2) propaganda, 3) agitation, and 4) technical matters.

A sitting of the organisation section on March 5, 1905, discussed a report by A. M. Essen (Stepanov) on how to organise work mainly among the non-proletarian sections of the population (students, soldiers and peasants). Lenin spoke thrice: first, after the report, then after a speech by Robert (unidentified), and again in connection with a speech by Olga (S. N. Ravich), who proposed that Lenin should be invited to take part in drawing up a "questionnaire" in view of his wide experience of practical work in Russia.

When Lenin says: "I did draw up a questionnaire, but it was much too general", he means his "Questionnaire" (see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 200-01). p. 139

[152] In a resolution carried by No. 14 of *Vperyod* on April 12 (March 30), 1905, the workers condemned the split in the Party and demanded immediate unity. p. 141

[153] A reference to the resolutions of the Menshevik Kharkov Committee, on the election of a delegate to the Third R.S.D.L.P. Congress, and of the Kharkov Bolshevik group, on the need to unite the Party "on the basis of a common, strictly principled tactics and centralised organisation". Both were published in No. 14 of *Vperyod*. p. 141

[154] A reference to the agreement between the M.C.B. and the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee on the convocation of the Third Party Congress. The principles of the agreement were set out in the appeal "To the Party" on behalf of the Central Committee and the M.C.B. on March 12 (25), 1905, which was published in No. 13 of *Vperyod* on April 5 (March 23), 1905, in Lenin's article "The Second Step". The agreement said that "further work in connection with convening the Congress is to be carried jointly by the M.C.B. and the C.C., which form an Organising Committee". Lenin gave an assessment of the agreement in his articles "The Second Step" and "The Council Is Caught Out" (see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 262-66, 330-34). p. 141

[155] *The Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.* was held in London from April 12 to 27 (April 25 to May 10), 1905. It had been prepared by the Bolsheviks and was directed by Lenin. The Mensheviks refused to attend it and met for a conference at Geneva.

The Congress was attended by 38 delegates: 24 with vote, and 14 with voice only. Delegates from twenty-one R.S.D.L.P. committees had votes. Lenin was a delegate from the Odessa Committee. Among the delegates were V. V. Vorovsky, R. S. Zemlyachka, N. K. Krupskaya, A. A. Bogdanov, A. V. Lunacharsky, M. M. Litvinov and M. G. Tskhakaya. Lenin was elected chairman of the Congress.

The Congress examined the basic questions of the unfolding revolution in Russia and determined the tasks of the proletariat

and its party. Lenin wrote the draft resolutions on all the main questions debated by the Congress. He gave reports on Social-Democratic participation in a provisional revolutionary government and on the resolution concerning support for the peasant movement; he spoke on the armed uprising, the attitude to the government's tactics on the eve of the revolution, the relations between the workers and intellectuals in Social-Democratic organisations, the Party Rules, the report on the Central Committee's activity and other questions (see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 359-424). The Congress laid out the Party's strategic plan for the bourgeois-democratic revolution and defined the Party's tactical line. The Congress set out the organisation of an armed uprising as the Party's most important and pressing task. The Congress said that the victory of the armed popular uprising should lead to the establishment of a provisional revolutionary government, whose task would be to suppress the resistance of the counter-revolution, carry out the R.S.D.L.P. minimum programme, and prepare the conditions for the transition to a socialist revolution.

The Congress reviewed the Party Rules: it adopted Lenin's formulation of Paragraph One, which deals with Party membership; eliminated the duocentric system (the C.C. and the C.O.) in the Party, and set up a single governing Party centre—the Central Committee; it gave a precise definition to the C.C.'s powers and its relations with the local committees.

The Congress condemned the acts of the Mensheviks and their opportunism in organisational and tactical questions. In view of the fact that *Iskra* had fallen into Menshevik hands and was conducting an opportunist line, the Congress authorised the Central Committee to set up a new Central Organ, *Proletary*. A Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee on April 27 (May 10), 1905, appointed Lenin editor of the newspaper.

The Third Congress was of tremendous historical importance. It was the first Bolshevik congress, which gave the Party and the working class a militant programme of struggle for the victory of the democratic revolution. For the work and importance of the Congress see Lenin's article "The Third Congress" (present edition Vol. 8, pp. 442-49). The Congress decisions were substantiated in Lenin's book *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* (see present edition, Vol. 9, pp. 15-140). p. 142

[156] These resolutions, written by Lenin, were adopted at the last sitting of the Organising Committee for Convening the Third R.S.D.L.P. Congress on April 11 (24), 1905, and announced in the O.C. report at the first sitting of the Congress on April 12 (25), 1905, by L. B. Krasin, member of the O.C. from the Central Committee (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, *Protokoly*, Moscow, 1959, pp. 30-31). p. 142

[157] This is a draft of point five of the resolution adopted by the Organising Committee for Convening the Third R.S.D.L.P. Congress on April 11 (24), 1905 (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, pp. 31-32). The basic propositions of this document were also

included in the resolution on the constitution of the Congress motioned by P. A. Krasikov (Belsky), M. S. Leshchinsky (Zharkov) and M. M. Litvinov (Kuznetsov) at the third sitting of the Congress on April 13 (26), and adopted at its fifth sitting on April 14 (27), 1905 (ibid., p. 96). p. 144

[158] No Kazan Committee delegate attended the Congress until the eighteenth sitting, in view of the fact that the Organising Committee had been unable to contact the Kazan Committee in good time. V. V. Adoratsky, a member of the Kazan Committee, was abroad at the time. To ensure the attendance of the Kazan organisation, Lenin wrote to the Credentials Committee, suggesting that Adoratsky should be invited to attend the Congress with voice but no vote as a member of the Kazan Committee. The Credentials Committee proposed that Adoratsky should be invited "simply as a member of the Party", and it is this formula that Lenin found strange.

The Congress, by a majority, with two against, decided to invite Adoratsky "as a member of the committee". It proved to be impossible to inform Adoratsky of this decision, and he did not attend the Congress. Only by the eighteenth sitting did a delegate from the Kazan Committee arrive. He was I. A. Sammer (Savich), who was allowed voice but no vote. p. 145

[159] N. A. Alexeyev (Andreyev) motioned this resolution: "The O.C. report shall be discussed in factual terms, and not in terms of principle or morality". In the debate on this question, Andreyev adhered to the resolution motioned by Lenin (see p. 147), which was adopted by the Congress. p. 146

[160] The draft agenda was discussed at the third, afternoon, sitting on April 13 (26), 1905.

Variants of the draft agenda are published in the "Preparatory Material" section of Vol. 9 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works* (pp. 375-78).

This draft was circulated among the delegates for comments, and then with slight changes in the wording was read out at the Congress as the draft signed by Lenin, M. M. Litvinov (Kuznetsov) and A. A. Bogdanov (Maximov). p. 147

[161] The proposal put forward by D. S. Postolovsky (Mikhailov) A. V. Lunacharsky (Voinov) and L. B. Krasin (Zimin) was that the Congress agenda should be drawn up under four heads: organisational questions, tactical questions, attitude to other parties and delegates' reports. This proposal was adopted. In the subsequent discussion and amendment, the agenda was adopted with these main heads: 1) tactical questions; 2) organisational questions; 3) attitude to other parties; 4) work within the Party; 5) delegates' reports; 6) elections. p. 148

[162] The draft motioned by Ivanov (A. A. Bogdanov), which Lenin mentions, was the new draft Rules of the R.S.D.L.P. submitted to the Congress by the Majority Committees' Bureau. It was published in No. 13 of *Vperyod* on April 5 (March 23), 1905, under the

title "Organisational Question". The draft, with some amendments outlined at preliminary meetings of delegates, was read out by Bogdanov (Maximov) at the fifteenth, afternoon, sitting of the Congress on April 20 (May 3). Following a discussion and the introduction of a number of amendments, the Rules were adopted at the seventeenth, afternoon, sitting on April 21 (May 4).

The remarks of N. F. (E. E. Essen) on Ivanov's draft were published under the title "Concerning the Draft Party Rules" in the Supplement to No. 15 of *Vperyod* on April 20 (7), 1905. p. 149

[163] Lenin erroneously calls V. V. Adoratsky, Arnatsky. p. 150

[164] During the discussion of this question at the fourth sitting of the Congress on April 14 (27), 1905, Lenin said that he had not proposed an invitation for V. V. Filatov (NN), but had merely handed his written request to the Congress (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 80).

The proposal to invite Filatov to the Congress with voice was rejected. p. 151

[165] At the fourth sitting of the Congress (on the morning of April 14 [27]), Lenin spoke twice (for the second speech, see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 365-67): After the report of the Credentials Committee, there was a debate on the granting of votes to the Bolshevik organisations which had existed and worked parallel to the Menshevik committees (the Kharkov and Yekaterinoslav groups and the Committee of the Organisation Abroad) and also to the Archangel Committee, which had not been confirmed.

V. M. Obukhov (Kamsky) said that the granting of votes to the "C.O.A. and the parallel groups is a coup d'état in form and in substance".

Under a Congress decision, all these organisations were given voice but no vote. p. 151

[166] Under the Party Rules adopted by the Second R.S.D.L.P. Congress, only organisations confirmed not less than one year before the Congress had the right of representation at the Congress. Under the Rules, the Kazan and Kuban committees were not regarded as fully empowered at the Third Congress, because they were not on the list of full-fledged committees in the minutes of the Party Council prior to September 1, 1904. At the fifth sitting of the Third Party Congress on April 14 (27), V. V. Vorovsky (Orlovsky) motioned a draft resolution written by Lenin on confirming these committees as full-fledged forthwith. The resolution was adopted at the same sitting. p. 151

[167] At the fifth sitting of the Congress on April 14 (27), as it was confirming the Kazan and Kuban committees as being full-fledged forthwith, some delegates said that it was undesirable for delegates with voice only to take part in the voting, as this could have an effect on the results of this crucial decision.

In this connection, Lenin wrote the draft resolution on the procedure governing the voting of questions at the Congress which was adopted at the same sitting. p. 151

[168] A reference to the speech by A. I. Rykov (Sergeyev) at the thirteenth sitting of the Congress against the draft resolution motioned by V. I. Lenin and P. P. Rumyantsev (Filippov). Rykov said that "the resolution does not apply to the agenda" and that its points "could be referred to the question of the liberals and agitation"; he proposed that they should be examined during the discussion of the corresponding items on the agenda. The Congress rejected Rykov's proposal, and adopted the draft resolution. p. 155

[169] When the thirteenth sitting of the Congress discussed the draft resolution on the attitude towards the government's tactics on the eve of a revolution, there was a great debate on point "c" of the resolutive section, which read: "To organise the proletariat for the immediate introduction, in a revolutionary way, of an 8-hour working day and for the implementation of all the main demands of our minimum programme." P. A. Krasikov (Belsky) objected to the words "revolutionary way", and proposed their substitution by the words "actual gain".

As a result of the debate, the point was adopted in the following wording: "To organise the proletariat for the immediate implementation, in a revolutionary way, of an 8-hour working day and the impending demands of the working class" (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 222). p. 155

[170] During the discussion at the fifteenth sitting on April 20 (May 3) of the report and draft resolution of A. A. Bogdanov (Maximov) on the relations between workers and intellectuals in Social-Democratic organisations, some delegates asserted that there was no such problem in the Party, and that there was no need to adopt any resolution on it.

The Congress resolved to defer the matter until the adoption of the Party Rules.

At the nineteenth sitting on April 22 (May 5), the Congress resumed its discussion of the question. A number of resolutions were motioned. Lenin's draft (see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 407-08), which he motioned jointly with A. A. Bogdanov, was adopted as a basis for the discussion. Lenin spoke several times (see ibid., pp. 411, 412). By a roll-call vote the Congress decided not to adopt any special resolution on the question. Lenin's proposals were taken into account in the resolution on propaganda and agitation. p. 157

[171] The speeches were not taken down in shorthand, and in accordance with the standing orders, every speaker had to submit a summary of his speech to the Congress Bureau within two hours of the sitting (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 11). p. 157

[172] During the debate on the draft Party Rules, the Congress substantially reworked the Party's organisational principles, chiefly on three main questions: 1) amendment of §1 of the Rules; 2) precise definition of the powers of the Central Committee and an extension of the autonomy of local committees; 3) establishment of a single centre. The Congress adopted §1 as worded by Lenin. By a

majority, the Congress abandoned the dual centre arrangement, in the form of the C.C. and the C.O., which the Second Congress had set up. One centre—the Central Committee—was retained. The Third Congress devoted a great deal of attention to the demarcation of the powers of the Central Committee and those of the local committees, and to the relations between the committees and the periphery, which was granted more powers. By a majority, the Congress decided to expunge §8 from the draft Rules and adopt a special resolution on the question Lenin voted for retaining §8 in the Rules. The nineteenth sitting on April 22 (May 5) adopted a resolution motioned by V. V. Vorovsky (Orlovsky) on the duty of the centres to inform the periphery about Party affairs and to reckon with their voice, the resolution which replaced §8 of the Rules (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, pp. 325, 327-28).

To prevent the committees from abusing their autonomy, and to make it possible to replace the committees which do not justify themselves, §9 of the new Rules said: "A local committee must be dissolved by the C.C. if two-thirds of the C.C. and two-thirds of the local workers, belonging to the Party organisations declare for such dissolution". For two of Lenin's speeches during the debate on the Party Rules on April 21 (May 4) see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 413-15. p. 158

[173] §6 of the draft Rules published in No. 13 of *Vperyod* on April 5 (March 23), 1905, said: "All organisations within the Party shall autonomously manage all matters relating specially and exclusively to that sphere of Party activity for the dealing with which they have been set up." The Third Congress adopted §6 in a different wording (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 461). p. 158

[174] Under §7 of the draft Party Rules, every Party organisation with the right of vote at the Congress had the right to publish Party literature at its own expense and on its own behalf. O. A. Kvitkin (Petrov) came out for §7 with the amendment of A. A. Bogdanov (Maximov) to the effect that "all periodical Party publications shall publish all the C.C. statements at its request". P. A. Krasikov (Belsky) proposed that permission to publish Party literature should be given only when the practical slogans contained in it were in complete accord with the decisions of international Social-Democratic congresses and Party congresses. §7 of the Party Rules was adopted in the wording proposed by D. S. Postolovsky (Mikhailov) with the amendment by A. A. Bogdanov (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 461). P. A. Krasikov's amendment was rejected. p. 159

[175] During the debate on §11 of the draft Party Rules, which said that "Every Party organisation shall place before both the C.C. and the C.O. Editorial Board all the means for making a study of all its activity and all its members", A. M. Essen (Kitayev) motioned the following addendum: "submitting detailed reports to the C.C. on its activity, at least twice a month". After Lenin's speech, this addendum was adopted. p. 159

[176] A reference to §12 of the draft Rules, which said that "Co-optation of members to the C.C. shall be unanimous". The unanimity proposal was adopted. p. 159

[177] §13 of the draft Rules said: "The Committee of Party Organisations Abroad has the aim of conducting propaganda and agitation abroad and also of promoting the movement in Russia. It shall provide support to the movement in Russia only through persons and groups specially designated by the C.C."

The resolution of P. A. Krasikov (Belsky) said: "The Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. authorises the C.C. to examine and approve the Rules of the Organisation Abroad with the rights of a full-fledged Party committee conducting propaganda and agitation abroad, with the proviso that the Committee of Organisations Abroad shall give assistance and support to the movement in Russia only through persons and groups specially designated by the C.C."

The Congress deleted §13 from the Rules and adopted P. A. Krasikov's resolution. p. 159

[178] The draft resolution of A. A. Bogdanov (Maximov) on general meetings of the C.C. said: "The Congress makes it binding on the C.C. to have periodical meetings—at least once in three months—of both its parts", i.e., of the C.C. sections in Russia and abroad.

The resolution was adopted with an amendment stating that these meetings were to be held "at least once in four months" (*Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 466). p. 159

[179] At the eighteenth sitting of the Congress on April 22 (May 5), the question of the Kazan Committee's representation came up once again with the arrival of its delegate I. A. Sammer (Savich). The Credentials Committee proposed that the Congress "should abide by its earlier decision and admit the Kazan Committee delegate with voice but no vote" (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 314).

Sammer asked the Congress to allow his committee a vote. After a debate, the Congress rejected a resolution motioned by B. V. Avilov (Tigrov) on granting a vote to the Kazan Committee and confirmed the Credentials Committee's resolution. p. 160

[180] The draft resolution said: "Recognising the unification of Party work to be an urgent demand of Party life, recognising that such unification is best achieved in the process of work and in joint discussion of general Party slogans by as many Party workers as possible—the Third Party Congress recognises it as desirable that the C.C. should, for these purposes, organise conferences of representatives of local committees."

Lenin motioned amendments to the resolution and supported L. B. Krasin (Zimin) and D. S. Postolovsky (Mikhailov), who opposed the addenda motioned by G. L. Shklovsky (Dedushkin) and A. I. Rykov (Sergeyev) (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 342). Lenin's amendments were adopted. p. 161

[181] The draft resolution is in Lenin's hand. It was motioned at the twentieth sitting by A. M. Essen (Kitayev) and R. S. Zemlyachka

(Osipov). It was adopted by the Congress as not subject to publication. p. 161

[182] A draft resolution motioned by P. P. Rumyantsev (Filippov) said that there should be no agitation on the periphery and in the workers' masses against whole Menshevik organisations or against individuals refusing to accept the Congress decisions, and that dissolution of Menshevik committees and establishment of Bolshevik committees where parallel organisations exist should be carried out in a most cautious manner, only when it was quite clear that a majority of the local committee members had refused to accept the decisions of the Third R.S.D.L.P. Congress. After a debate, the first part of the resolution was rejected, and the second adopted in the wording of Lenin and Bogdanov (Maximov) as not subject to publication (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 363). p. 162

[183] The twenty-first sitting on April 23 (May 6) discussed a draft resolution on the attitude towards non-Russian Social-Democratic organisations motioned by V. V. Vorovsky (Orlovsky). It said: "...The Third R.S.D.L.P. Congress, reaffirming the attitude of the Second Congress on the question of federalism, authorises both the C.C. and the local committees to do their utmost to reach agreement with the national Social-Democratic organisations for the purpose of co-ordinating local work, thereby paving the way for a possible unification of all Social-Democratic parties into a single R.S.D.L.P." (*Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 365).

D. S. Postolovsky (Mikhailov) proposed the following text: "authorises the C.C., as well as the local organisations, to make *joint* efforts" (ibid.). He argued that agreement could be reached only "when it was arranged not only by the C.C. but by the local committees as well" (ibid., p. 371). This amendment was opposed by Lenin and rejected by the Congress. p. 162

[184] In addition to what A. V. Lunacharsky (Voinov) said, Lenin quoted a Moscow report which appeared in *The Times* No. 37700 on May 6, 1905, under the title "Zemstvo Congress at Moscow. Purposes and Prospects".

On the Zemstvo congress in Moscow see Lenin's article "The Advice of the Conservative Bourgeoisie" (present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 457-60).

The Times—a daily founded in London in 1785; one of the leading conservative papers of the British bourgeoisie. p. 163

[185] The twenty-third sitting heard and discussed the C.C. report given by L. B. Krasin (Zimin). Some speakers noted that the report failed to describe the political activity of the Central Committee and demanded that the C.C. representative tell the Congress why the C.C. had not succeeded in guiding the Party as its political leader. Those were the statements Lenin had in mind when he spoke of the "trial" in his second speech on the C.C. report. p. 163

[186] The resolution was adopted unanimously. p. 164

[187] The draft resolution on propaganda and agitation was discussed and adopted at the twenty-second sitting on April 25 (May 8). Lenin's amendments and addenda were adopted and written into the resolution (see *Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 457).

The amendment to point "a" was written by Lenin and tabled by A. A. Aristarkhov (Osetrov) and V. M. Obukhov (Kamsky). p. 165

[188] Point "c" of the draft resolution read as follows: "take measures to organise in all the main areas of Russia travelling agitation groups under the direction of responsible district agitators, to assist the local centres". Lenin's amendment replaced this text. p. 165

[189] O. A. Kvitkin (Petrov) proposed the words "armed force" at the end of the draft resolution on the events in the Caucasus to be replaced by the words "all the means at their disposal" (*Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P.*, p. 442). Kvitkin's amendment was adopted. p. 166

[190] Lenin gave the lecture on the subject in Geneva on May 19 or 20 (June 1 or 2), and soon after that in Paris. In a letter to L. A. Fotieva, who was in Paris, Lenin wrote on June 1 or 2 that he intended to go to Paris and asked her to organise his report on "The Third Congress and its Decisions". The content of the report was, Lenin wrote, "a parallel analysis of our decisions and those of the Mensheviks. They have just issued an announcement about their conference, and I will analyse it" (see present edition, Vol. 36, p. 148). By announcement he meant the Menshevik pamphlet *First All-Russia Conference of Party Workers*, issued as a supplement to No. 100 of *Iskra* on May 15, 1905. In his plan Lenin refers to pages in this pamphlet.

Lenin elaborated on some points of his plan in the article "A Third Step Back", which was published later (see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 544-54). p. 166

[191] See present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 461-81. p. 168

[192] See "Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League" (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 106-17). p. 168

[193] This sets out the milestones in the struggle between the revolutionary and the opportunist trends in Russian Social-Democracy. There is no article written to this plan.

Lenin characterised the stages of the internal Party struggle prior to the Third R.S.D.L.P. Congress in his "A Brief Outline of the Split in the R.S.D.L.P. A Letter to Greulich", which he wrote in February 1905 (see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 125-31). Roughly the same stages as in the present article are given in his plan written in August 1905 and entitled "Plekhanov and the new *Iskra*" (see *Lenin Miscellany V*, 1926, pp. 360-66). p. 168

[194] A reference to the resolutions of the "Unity" Congress of R.S.D.L.P. Organisations Abroad, held in September 1901. It was attended by six members of the *Iskra* and *Zarya* organisation abroad (among them V. I. Lenin, N. K. Krupskaya and L. Martov), eight members of the *Sotsial-Demokrat* organisation (including three members of the Emancipation of Labour group: G. V. Plekhanov, P. B. Axelrod and V. I. Zasulich), 16 members of the Union of Russian Social-Democrats (including five members of the Bund Committee Abroad) and three members of the *Borba* group. At the Congress Lenin who attended under the name of Frey, spoke about the Union's opportunist actions. When the Union tabled its opportunist amendments and addenda to a resolution condemning opportunism and recognising the need for the unity of all Social-Democratic forces in Russia on the basis of *Iskra*'s revolutionary principles the revolutionary section of the Congress (members of the *Iskra* and *Zarya* and the *Sotsial-Demokrat* organisations) issued a statement on the impossibility of unification and left the Congress. On Lenin's initiative, these organisations in October 1901 united into the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad. p. 168

[195] A reference to the grouping of votes at the Second R.S.D.L.P. Congress, which was held from July 17 (30) to August 10 (23) 1903. The Congress was attended by 43 delegates with 51 votes. Of them 24 votes belonged to the *Iskra* majority, 9 to the *Iskra* minority, 10 to the "Marsh", and 8 to the anti-*Iskra* group (3 *Rabocheye Dyelo* members and 5 Bundists). For details of the struggle at the Congress see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 332-47. p. 168

[196] The Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. ended on August 10 (23), 1903, and on August 15 (28) *Iskra*'s No. 46, in the editing of which Lenin and Plekhanov took part, was issued. The exact meaning of Lenin's reference to August 13 (26) has not been established. On November 13 (26) Plekhanov co-opted the Mensheviks Axelrod, Martov, Zasulich and Potresov to the *Iskra* Editorial Board. p. 168

[197] A reference to Martov's words at the Second Congress of the League of Russian Revolutionary Social-Democracy Abroad, which took place from October 13 (26) to 18 (31), 1903, to the effect that he Martov, would refuse to work with Martynov on the same Editorial Board. p. 168

[198] A possible reference to the letter sent on September 25-26 (October 8-9), 1903, by *Iskra*'s former editors to Lenin and Plekhanov, in which they refused to collaborate on *Iskra* (see present edition, Vol. 7, p. 353). p. 168

[199] A reference to the conference of 22 Bolsheviks and the Declaration of 19 Bolsheviks. The conference was held in the first half of August 1904.

Declaration of the Twenty-Two—an appeal "To the Party" written by Lenin and adopted at the Bolshevik conference in Geneva, in the first half of August 1904 (see present edition, Vol. 7, pp. 452-59). The conference was attended by 19 persons, among them V. I. Lenin, N. K. Krupskaya, M. S. Olminsky, M. N. Lyadov and P. N. Lepeshinsky. Three other Bolsheviks soon adhered to their decisions and the appeal "To the Party" was issued on behalf of the 22. This was published in a special leaflet in August 1904 and became the Bolshevik programme in the struggle for convening the Third Party Congress.

The Declaration of the nineteen was issued by the Moscow Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. in October 1904 under the title "Appeal to Members of the R.S.D.L.P." (see *Sbornik dokumentov i materialov "Trety syezd R.S.D.R.P."* [Collection of Documents and Material "Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P."], Moscow, 1955, pp. 99-106). p. 169

[200] These dates denote the period from the conference of 22 Bolsheviks (first half of August 1904) to the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., which was held from April 12 (25) to April 27 (May 10), 1905. p. 169

[201] A reference to the mutiny on the battleship *Potemkin*, which broke out on June 14 (27), 1905. The ship entered Odessa, just then in the grip of a general strike, but no use was made of the favourable conditions for joint action by the workers and sailors. The Bolshevik organisation in Odessa had been weakened by arrests, and was not united. The Mensheviks were opposed to an armed uprising and tried to restrain the workers and sailors from offensive operations. The tsarist government sent the whole of its Black Sea Fleet to crush the *Potemkin* mutiny, but the sailors refused to fire at the insurgent ship, and their commanders were forced to withdraw the fleet. After sailing the seas for eleven days, the *Potemkin*, short of food and coal, made for Rumania and there surrendered to the Rumanian authorities. Most of its sailors remained abroad. Those of them who returned were arrested and committed for trial.

The *Potemkin* mutiny failed but the fact that the crew of a major warship had gone over to the revolution was an important advance in the struggle against the autocracy. Lenin said the uprising was an "attempt to form the *nucleus of a revolutionary army*" (see present edition, Vol. 8, p. 562). p. 169

[202] It has not been established whether Lenin did write and publish the leaflet (proclamation). p. 171

[203] *Moskovskiye Vedomosti* (Moscow Recorder)—one of the oldest Russian newspapers published by Moscow University from 1756 (initially as a small bulletin). From 1863 to 1887, the ultra-reactionary and chauvinist M. N. Katkov was its publisher and editor, turning it into a monarchist and nationalist mouthpiece for the most reactionary sections of the landowners and the clergy; from

1905, the paper was one of the main organs of the Black Hundreds. It was published until the October Socialist Revolution. p. 173

[204] *Vestnik Yevropy* (European Messenger)—a historical, political and literary monthly of a liberal bourgeois trend published in St. Petersburg from 1866 to 1918. It carried articles against the revolutionary Marxists. p. 173

[205] *Rus* (Russia)—a liberal bourgeois daily published in St. Petersburg from December 1903. Its publisher and editor was A. A. Suvorin. During the 1905 revolution, the paper was close to the Cadets, but took a more moderate stand. It was closed down on December 2 (15), 1905, and subsequently appeared at intervals under various names: *Rus*, *Molva* (Tidings), *XX vek* (Twentieth Century), *Oko* (Eye) and *Novaya Rus* (New Russia). p. 173

[206] *Proletary* (Proletarian)—an illegal Bolshevik weekly, the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P., set up under a resolution of the Third Party Congress. Lenin was appointed its editor-in-chief by a decision of the Central Committee's Plenary Meeting on April 27 (May 10), 1905. It was published in Geneva from May 14 (27) to November 12 (25), 1905. There were 26 issues. The paper continued the line of the old, Leninist *Iskra* and retained full continuity with the Bolshevik newspaper *Vperyod*.

Lenin wrote about 90 articles and notes for the newspaper. Among those who constantly took part in the work of its Editorial Board were V. V. Vorovsky, A. V. Lunacharsky and M. S. Olminsky. N. K. Krupskaya, V. M. Velichkina and V. A. Karpinsky did a great deal of work for the Editorial Board. The paper was closely allied with the working-class movement in Russia and carried articles and notes from workers taking a direct part in the revolutionary movement. Local reports were collected and sent on to Geneva by V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich, S. I. Gusev and A. I. Ulyanova-Yelizarova. N. K. Krupskaya and L. A. Fotieva carried on the correspondence with local Party organisations and readers.

Proletary instantly responded to all the important events in the Russian and international labour movement and waged a relentless struggle against the Mensheviks and other opportunist and revisionist elements. The paper carried out a great deal of work for the propaganda of the Third Party Congress decisions and played an important part in the Bolsheviks' organisational and ideological unity.

Soon after Lenin's departure for Russia in early November 1905 the paper ceased publication. The last two issues (Nos. 25 and 26) were edited by V. V. Vorovsky, but they also contained several articles by Lenin, which were published after his departure from Geneva. p. 173

[207] For the criticism on this question of the Menshevik *Iskra* and the Bund, see Lenin's article "The Theory of Spontaneous Generation" (present edition, Vol. 9, pp. 246-51). p. 173

[208] The article was not written. p. 174

[209] *The Cadets*—members of the Constitutional-Democratic Party, the leading party of the liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie in Russia. It was set up in October 1905 and consisted of members of the bourgeoisie, Zemstvo leaders from among the landowners, and bourgeois intellectuals. Among its prominent leaders were P. N. Milyukov, S. A. Muromtsev, V. A. Maklakov, A. I. Shingaryov, P. B. Struve and F. I. Rodichev. To deceive the working people, the Cadets called themselves "the party of people's freedom", but actually went no further in their demands than a constitutional monarchy. After the October Socialist Revolution the Cadets operated as bitter enemies of the Soviet power and took part in all the armed counter-revolutionary action and campaigns of the interventionists. After the defeat of the interventionists and the whiteguards, the Cadets emigrated and continued their anti-Soviet counter-revolutionary activity. p. 174

[210] *Nasha Zhizn* (Our Life)—A liberal daily published in St. Petersburg, with interruptions, from November 6 (19), 1904, to July 11 (24), 1906. p. 174

[211] *Birzheviye Vedomosti* (Stock-Exchange Recorder)—a bourgeois newspaper founded in 1880. It was published in St. Petersburg, first thrice a week, then four times a week, and then daily. From November 1902 it had two editions: morning and afternoon. Its name became a byword for adaptation, corruption and lack of principle. It was closed down by the Revolutionary Military Committee at the end of October 1917. p. 174

[212] A reference to Karl Marx's statements about Ledru-Rollin in his work *The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850* (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 118-242). p. 174

[213] This is a critique of the tactical line followed by the bourgeois liberals who, in the magazine *Osvobozhdeniye* (Emancipation) and other periodicals, sharply opposed the idea of an armed uprising, rejected the idea of boycotting the Bulygin Duma and called for participation in it.

Lenin criticised Kautsky's stand on the provisional revolutionary government (point 3 of the "Note") in his article "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution" (see present edition, Vol. 9, pp. 108-09).

The question of making use of "elderly" workers (point 5 of the "Note" was elaborated in Lenin's letter to S. I. Gusev of September 30 (October 13), 1905 (see present edition, Vol. 34, pp. 358-59).

Lenin elaborated the question of the Social-Democratic attitude to parliament (point 6 of the "Note") in his letter to A. V. Lunacharsky of September 28 (October 11), 1905 (see present edition, Vol. 34, pp. 352-53). p. 175

[214] A quotation from N. A. Nekrasov's poem *Who Can Be Happy and Free in Russia*; the whole stanza says:

Mother Rus!
You are wretched,
You are rich,
You are powerful,
You are powerless! p. 175

[215] *The Economist*—a British economic and political weekly published in London since 1843; an organ of the big industrial bourgeoisie. p. 176

[216] No. 25 of *Proletary* on November 16 (3), 1905, carried V. A. Karpinsky's article "The Peasant Congress", signed V. Kalinin. Lenin edited the article and made two insertions. p. 177

[217] *General redistribution*—a slogan expressing the peasants' striving for a general redistribution of the land and the elimination of landed estates.

In his article "The Agrarian Programme of Russian Social-Democracy", Lenin said that the demand for a general redistribution, together with the reactionary utopian idea of perpetuating small-scale peasant production, also had its revolutionary side, namely, "the desire to sweep away by means of a peasant revolt all the remnants of the serf-owning system" (present edition, Vol. 6, p. 137).

Later, at the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., Lenin said: "We are told that the peasants will not be satisfied with our programme and will go further. But we are not afraid of that; we have our socialist programme for that eventuality, and consequently are not afraid even of a redistribution of the land" (present edition, Vol. 6, p. 495). p. 177

[218] *The St. Petersburg City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.* was called by the St. Petersburg Committee on February 11 (24), 1906, to decide on the attitude to the Duma. The conference was guided by Lenin and was attended by 65 delegates with vote. Elections to the conference were held after discussion and voting on the tactical platforms of the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, with one delegate from thirty voting Party members. The Bolsheviks won a substantial majority. The Mensheviks demanded the invalidation of the votes of the district R.S.D.L.P. organisation, which was almost entirely Bolshevik. Lenin made speeches and remarks during the debate on the question of the district R.S.D.L.P. organisation (see present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 123-25). The conference confirmed the representation of the district organisation. It heard a report from the St. Petersburg Committee and adopted Lenin's resolution recognising the representation at the conference valid, the conference effective and its decisions binding. Lenin gave the report on the attitude to the Duma (there is no record of it in the minutes). At the end of his report Lenin read out a resolution on the tactics of active boycott. The Menshevik

resolution was read out by Martov. By 36 votes to 29, the conference came out in favour of the active boycott, but had no time to adopt a resolution giving detailed motivation of the tactic.

To discuss this and give it final approval, a second city conference of the St. Petersburg organisation was called at the end of February and the beginning of March. It was attended by 62 delegates and discussed draft resolutions tabled by Lenin, Martov and an additional one by the Mensheviks of Okhta District. After a long and bitter struggle, the conference adopted Lenin's resolution by 35 to 24 with one abstention. It set up a committee, which included Lenin, to give the final wording to the resolution. The Mensheviks refused to take part in the committee and walked out. p. 178

[219] A reference to the proposal of I. A. Konovalov (Nikolai) at the St. Petersburg City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. on February 11 (24), 1906, to close the debate on the district and Vyborg organisations; to recognise the vote as correct and the representation as valid, and proceed with the agenda of the conference. p. 179

[220] *The Fourth* (*Unity*) *Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.* was held at Stockholm from April 10 to 25 (April 23 to May 8), 1906.

It was attended by 112 delegates with vote, representing 57 local organisations of the R.S.D.L.P., and 22 delegates with voice only. National organisations were also represented: the Social-Democracy of Poland and Lithuania, the Bund, the Latvian Social-Democratic Labour Party, the Ukrainian Social-Democratic Labour Party and the Finnish Labour Party. There was also a representative of the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

Among the Bolshevik delegates were V. I. Lenin, M. V. Frunze, M. I. Kalinin, N. K. Krupskaya, A. V. Lunacharsky, F. A. Sergeyev (Artyom), S. G. Shahumyan, I. I. Skvortsov-Stepanov, J. V. Stalin, V. V. Vorovsky, K. Y. Voroshilov and Y. M. Yaroslavsky.

The Mensheviks had a majority at the Congress because many Bolshevik Party organisations, which had led the armed action by the masses, were broken up and could not send their delegates. The Central Area, the Urals, Siberia and the North—Bolshevik bulwarks—were represented by a small number of delegates. By contrast, the Mensheviks, who had the more numerous organisations in the country's non-industrial areas, where there had been no mass revolutionary action, were in a position to send more delegates.

There was a bitter struggle between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks on every point of the Congress agenda. Lenin gave reports on the agrarian question, the assessment of the current situation and the class tasks of the proletariat, on the attitude to the Duma, the armed uprising and other questions, and took part in the committee drafting the Party Rules (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 277-309). The character of the decisions was determined by the numerical superiority of the Mensheviks. After

a stubborn struggle, the Congress approved the Menshevik resolutions on the Duma and the armed uprising, and adopted their agrarian programme.

On the attitude to bourgeois parties, the Congress confined itself to endorsing the resolution of the International Congress at Amsterdam. Without debate, it adopted the compromise resolution on the trade unions and the resolution on the attitude to the peasant movement.

At the same time, on the demand of the Party masses, the Congress adopted Paragraph One of the Rules in Lenin's wording, rejecting Martov's opportunist formula. The Bolshevik proposition on democratic centralism was included in the Rules for the first time.

The Congress decided on the question of uniting with the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania and the Latvian Social-Democratic Labour Party, which joined the R.S.D.L.P. as territorial organisations working among proletarians of all nationalities in their territories.

The Central Committee elected by the Congress included three Bolsheviks and seven Mensheviks. The Editorial Board of *Sotsial-Demokrat*, the Central Organ, consisted of Mensheviks only.

The Congress is known as the "Unity" Congress, but it marked only the formal unification of the R.S.D.L.P. Actually, the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks had their own views, their own platforms on the key revolutionary questions, and in fact remained two distinct parties. Lenin analysed the work of the Congress in his pamphlet *Report on the Unity Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.* (*A Letter to the St. Petersburg Workers*) (see present edition, Vol. 10, pp. 317-82). p. 179

[221] At the second sitting of the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., there was a discussion of the Congress standing orders under a draft put forward by the United Central Committee. A debate ensued on the question of the roll-call vote on the written statements submitted to the Congress Bureau. Two proposals were motioned: one by the Bolshevik P. P. Rumyantsev (Schmidt) and the other by the Menshevik M. A. Lurye (Larin). The former's was adopted. See *Chetvyorty* (*Obyedinitelny*) *syezd R.S.D.R.P. Aprel* (*aprel-mai*) *1906 goda. Protokoly* (Proceedings of the Fourth [Unity] Congress. April [April-May] 1906), Moscow, 1959, pp. 11-16. p. 179

[222] During the debate on the agenda at the third sitting of the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., the Menshevik F. I. Dan objected to the question of the current situation being put on the agenda. p. 180

[223] A reference to point two of the draft resolution of the Bolsheviks, "The Class Tasks of the Proletariat at the Present Moment of the Democratic Revolution", for the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. p. 181

[224] The twenty-fourth sitting of the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. decided on the question of uniting the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania with the R.S.D.L.P. p. 181

[225] *Rech* (Speech)—a daily, the Central Organ of the Cadet Party, published in St. Petersburg from February 23 (March 8), 1906, under the editorship of P. N. Milyukov and I. V. Hessen, and with close collaboration from M. M. Vinaver, P. D. Dolgorukov, P. B. Struve and others. The newspaper was closed down by the Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet on October 26 (November 8), 1917, but continued to appear until August 1918 under the names of *Nasha Rech* (Our Speech), *Svobodnaya Rech* (Free Speech), *Vek* (Age), *Novaya Rech* (New Speech), *Nash Vek* (This Age). p. 181

[226] *First Duma* (the so-called Witte Duma) was convened on April 27 (May 10), 1906, under an ordinance worked out by Chairman of the Council of Ministers S. Y. Witte.

Elected to the Duma were 478 deputies, over one-third of whom belonged to the Cadet Party. It was dissolved on July 8 (21), 1906.

Trudoviks—a group of petty-bourgeois democrats in Russian Dumas consisting of peasants and Narodnik-minded intellectuals. The Trudovik group was formed in April 1906 from the peasant deputies of the First Duma.

In the Duma the Trudoviks vacillated between the Cadets and the Social-Democrats, which was due to the class character of the peasant petty proprietors. In view of the fact that the Trudoviks represented the peasant masses, the Bolsheviks in the Duma pursued the tactic of reaching agreement with them on various questions for conducting a common struggle against the tsarist autocracy and the Cadets. In 1917, the Trudovik group merged with the Popular Socialist Party and gave active support to the bourgeois Provisional Government. After the October Revolution the Trudoviks sided with the bourgeois counter-revolution. p. 182

[227] *Novoye Vremya* (New Times)—a daily published in St. Petersburg from 1868 to 1917 by various publishers, repeatedly changing its political orientation. Moderately liberal at first, it became an organ of reactionary landowner and official bureaucratic circles in 1876, when A. S. Suvorin took over as publisher. From 1905—an organ of the Black Hundreds. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917, the paper gave total support to the counter-revolutionary policy of the bourgeois Provisional Government and fiercely attacked the Bolsheviks. It was closed down by the Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet on October 26 (November 8), 1917. p. 184

[228] *Mysl* (Thought)—a political and literary daily, the legal organ of the S.R. Party, published in St. Petersburg from June 20 (July 3) to July 6 (19), 1906, in place of *Golos* (Voice), which had been closed down. Fifteen issues were published. p. 185

[229] *The Second* (*First All-Russia*) *Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.* was held at Tammerfors from November 3 to 7 (16-20), 1906. It was attended by 32 delegates with vote: 11 from the Mensheviks, 7 from the Bund, 6 from the Bolsheviks, 5 from the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania, and 3 from the Social-Democracy of the Latvian Territory. Members of the Central Committee and the Central Organ Editorial Board attended with voice only.

The Conference adopted the following agenda: 1. Electoral campaign. 2. Party Congress. 3. Labour Congress. 4. Struggle against the Black Hundreds and the pogroms. 5. Partisan activity.

The Menshevik C.C. secured a majority for the Mensheviks by bringing in a number of fictitious organisations, which enabled them to impose Menshevik resolutions on some questions. By 18 votes (Mensheviks and Bundists) to 14, the Conference adopted the Menshevik resolution "On the R.S.D.L.P.'s Tactics in the Electoral Campaign", which allowed blocs with the Cadets. To counter this opportunist resolution, Lenin motioned, on behalf of 14 delegates, a "Minority Opinion", the Bolshevik platform for the electoral campaign, which emphasised the need for the working-class Party to be organisationally and ideologically independent. It allowed for the possibility of temporary agreements only with the Trudoviks and the S.R.s as representing petty-bourgeois democracy (pp. 188-91) . Lenin criticised the Menshevik draft electoral platform, which the C.C. submitted for approval by the Conference, and motioned a number of amendments. Under Bolshevik pressure, the Conference adopted a resolution introducing the amendments.

The Conference adopted a resolution "On Unity in the Electoral Campaign in the Localities" with Lenin's amendment, which put a curb on the Menshevik C.C. in practising the tactics of setting up bloc with the Cadets in the localities (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 322-23).

Lenin insisted on the need for an emergency Party congress. The Conference decided to call the next congress not later than March 15 (28), 1907. Although the Bolsheviks demanded a discussion of the question of a "labour congress", believing agitation for it to be a violation of Party discipline, the Conference did not discuss the question, confining itself to a compromise resolution, "On the Limits of the Agitation for a Labour Congress".

There was no time to discuss the questions of fighting the Black Hundreds and the pogroms, or the partisan activity. The Conference authorised the C.C. to issue a brief report on the Conference, containing all the draft resolutions and minority opinions. But the Menshevik C.C., in its organ, *Sotsial-Demokrat*, published only the Conference resolutions, without the Bolsheviks' "Minority Opinions".

Lenin analysed and criticised the work of the Conference in his "Blocs with the Cadets" and "Party Discipline and the Fight Against the Pro-Cadet Social-Democrats" (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 307-19 and 320-23). p. 186

[230] Lenin's report was based on the Bolshevik resolution, later presented at the Conference as a "Minority Opinion" on behalf of the delegates of the Social-Democracy of Poland, the Latvian Territory, St. Petersburg, Moscow, the Central Industrial Region and the Volga area (pp. 188-91).

The Social-Democracy of the Latvian Territory—until 1906, the Latvian Social-Democratic Labour Party—was set up in June 1904 at the party's First Congress. At the Second L.S.D.L.P. Congress in June 1905, the party adopted its programme. From 1905 to 1907, the L.S.D.L.P. guided the revolutionary action by the workers. Lenin said that "during the revolution the Lettish proletariat and the Lettish Social-Democratic Party occupied one of the first and most important places in the struggle against the autocracy and all the forces of the old order" (see present edition, Vol. 16, p. 260).

At the Fourth (Unity) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. in 1906, the L.S.D.L.P. entered the R.S.D.L.P. as a territorial organisation, and after the Congress was called the Social-Democracy of the Latvian Territory. p. 186

[231] A reference to the Bolshevik draft declaration by the Duma Social-Democratic group, which was written by Lenin. Slightly abridged, it is quoted by Lenin in his article "The Declaration of Our Group in the Duma" (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 32-37). p. 187

[232] A reference to the resolution "On Tactics" adopted by the Bund's Seventh Congress, which was held at the end of August and beginning of September 1906. p. 189

[233] *The Second Duma* met on February 20 (March 5) 1907. The elections to the Duma were indirect and unequal, and were held in an atmosphere of reprisals and trials by military tribunals. Still, the Second Duma turned out to be more Leftist than the First, the reason being the more distinct demarcation between the parties than in the First Duma period, the growing class consciousness of the masses and the participation of the Bolsheviks in the elections.

The Bolsheviks used the Duma as a rostrum for exposing tsarism and the treacherous role of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, for proclaiming and propagandising the Party's revolutionary programme, for releasing the peasantry from the influence of the liberals and creating a revolutionary bloc in the Duma of representatives of the working class and the peasantry. This was an entirely new, revolutionary Marxist line of behaviour for proletarian delegates to take in a parliamentary institution. Meanwhile, the Mensheviks pursued the opportunist line of supporting the Cadets.

By mid-1907, when it became obvious that the workers and peasants lacked the strength to defeat tsarism, the tsarist government decided to disperse the Duma. On the night of June 2 (15), 1907, the Social-Democratic group in the Duma was arrested, and the Duma itself dissolved by the tsar's decree the following day. p. 189

[234] *Zionist socialists*—members of the Zionist Socialist Labour Party, a petty-bourgeois Jewish nationalist organisation formed in 1904. They believed the main task of the Jewish proletariat to be a struggle for obtaining their own territory and establishing a national state. They preached class co-operation with the Jewish bourgeoisie, strove to isolate Jewish workers from the revolutionary movement of the Russian and international proletariat, and tried to sow hostile feelings among the workers of different nationalities. The nationalistic activity of the Zionist socialists served to obscure the class consciousness of the Jewish workers and did great harm to the working-class movement.

After the February 1917 bourgeois-democratic revolution, the Zionist Socialist Labour Party merged with the Socialist Jewish Labour Party (S.J.L.P.) to form the United Jewish Socialist Labour Party. p. 191

[235] *Popular Socialists* (*P.S.*)—members of the petty-bourgeois Trudovik Popular Socialist Party which in 1906 split away from the Right wing of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party (S.R.s). The Popular Socialists favoured a bloc with the Cadets. Lenin used to call them "Social-Cadets", "philistine opportunists", "S.R. Mensheviks", vacillating between the Cadets and the S.R.s, and emphasised that the party "differs very little from the Cadets, for it deletes from its programme both republicanism and the demand for all the land" (see present edition, Vol. 11, p. 228). It was headed by A. V. Peshekhonov, N. F. Annensky, V. A. Myakotin and others. p. 191

[236] A reference to Lenin's article "The Crisis of Menshevism" published in No. 9 of *Proletary* on December 7 (20), 1906 (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 341-64).

Proletary (Proletarian)—an illegal Bolshevik newspaper published from August 21 (September 3), 1906, to November 28 (December 11), 1909, under the editorship of Lenin. Fifty issues appeared. Among those who took an active part in the editorial work were M. F. Vladimirsky, V. V. Vorovsky, A. V. Lunacharsky and I. F. Dubrovinsky; technical matters were handled by A. G. Shlikhter and Y. S. Shlikhter, among others. The first twenty issues were prepared for the press and set in Vyborg. In view of the sharp worsening of conditions for the publication of an illegal organ in Russia, the *Proletary* Editorial Board transferred the paper's publication abroad, in accordance with a decision of the St. Petersburg and Moscow committees of the R.S.D.L.P. (Nos. 21-40 were published in Geneva, and Nos. 41-50, in Paris).

Proletary was in fact the Central Organ of the Bolsheviks. Lenin carried out all the main work on its Board. More than 100 articles and notes by Lenin on the most important questions of the working-class revolutionary struggle were published in the paper, which had close contact with local Party organisations.

During the years of the Stolypin reaction, *Proletary* played an outstanding role in preserving and strengthening the Bolshevik

organisations and in fighting the liquidators, the otzovists-ultimatumists and the god-builders.

The paper ceased publication in accordance with the decisions of the January 1910 Plenary Meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee. p. 191

[237] A reference to the C.C. appeal "To All Party Organisations and All Social-Democratic Workers" on the convocation of the Fourth R.S.D.L.P. Congress. It was adopted on Lenin's proposal and published in No. 9 of the newspaper *Novaya Zhizn* on November 10 (23), 1905 (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh i resheniyakh*.... Part I, 1954, pp. 96-98).

Novaya Zhizn (New Life)—the first legal Bolshevik newspaper published daily in St. Petersburg from October 27 (November 9) to December 3 (16), 1905. Its official publisher and editor was the poet N. M. Minsky, and the publisher, M. F. Andreyeva. When Lenin returned to St. Petersburg from abroad in early November, the paper was edited by him. There was a change in the Editorial Board and contributors. *Novaya Zhizn* was in fact the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P. Among those who were most closely connected with the newspaper were M. S. Olminsky, V. V. Vorovsky, A. V. Lunacharsky and V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich. Maxim Gorky took an active part in the paper and also gave it large financial assistance. Among its foreign contributors were Rosa Luxemburg Karl Liebknecht, Marcel Cachin and Paul Lafargue. Fourteen of Lenin's articles appeared in the paper. In these articles, he defined the Party's tasks and tactics in the first Russian revolution.

Novaya Zhizn was a champion of all the decisions and measures of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee and played a great part in the political enlightenment and organisation of the masses mobilising them for the armed uprising.

In October 1905, Lenin wrote about *Novaya Zhizn*: "*Today* the broadest tribuna for our influence on the proletariat is a *daily* newspaper in St. Petersburg" (see present edition, Vol. 34, p. 365).

Novaya Zhizn was subjected to numerous reprisals. It was closed down by the tsarist government after its No. 27 on December 2. The last issue, No. 28, was published illegally. p. 192

[238] A reference to the First Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. held at Tammerfors (Finland) from December 12 to 17 (25-30), 1905. It was attended by representatives of 26 organisations. Lenin was elected chairman of the Conference. Among the participants were V. Y. Fridolin, L. M. Knipovich, L. B. Krasin, N. K. Krupskaya, P. F. Kudelli, S. A. Lozovsky, P. N. Mostovenko, V. I. Nevsky, V. A. Radus-Zenkovich, J. V. Stalin and Y. M. Yaroslavsky The Mensheviks were represented by E. L. Gurevich (V. Danevich).

The Conference had the following agenda: 1) Reports from the localities. 2) Report on the current situation. 3) Organisational report of the C.C. 4) On the merger of both parts of the R.S.D.L.P. 5) On Reorganising the Party. 6) The agrarian question. 7) On the Duma.

Lenin gave reports on the current situation and the agrarian question. The Conference came out for restoring Party unity and merging the practical centres of the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks and their Central Organs on a basis of equality, and also for mergers of parallel organisations in the localities, authorising the united C.C. to call a unity congress. In its resolution on "Party Reorganisation", the Conference recommended the practice of a broad electoral principle and the principle of democratic centralism. Departures from the latter were recognised as admissible only in the event of insuperable practical obstacles. In the "Agrarian Resolution" (on Lenin's report) the Conference, elaborating the decisions of the Third Congress, proposed that the point in the Party's agrarian programme dealing with "cut-off lands" should be replaced by the demand for the confiscation of all landed estates and state and church lands. The Conference adopted a resolution on an active boycott of the First Duma. In view of the fact that an armed uprising had already started in Moscow, the Conference, on Lenin's proposal, hastily wound up its work, and the delegates went home to take part in the uprising. p. 192

[239] *L'Humanité*—a daily founded in 1904 by Jaurès as the organ of the French Socialist Party. In 1905, the paper welcomed the revolution which had started in Russia, voicing the French people's solidarity with "the Russian nation creating its own 1789". The newspaper organised a collection of funds in aid of the Russian revolution. During the First World War (1914-18) the paper was in the hands of the extreme Right wing of the French Socialist Party and took a chauvinist stand.

In 1918, Marcel Cachin, the outstanding leader of the French and international working-class movement, became the paper's political director. From 1918 to 1920, the paper opposed the imperialist policy of the French Government, which had sent its troops to fight against the Soviet Republic. From December 1920, following the split in the French Socialist Party and the formation of the Communist Party of France, the paper became the latter's Central Organ. p. 192

[240] *La Tribune Russe*—a bulletin of the S.R. Party published in Paris in French from January 1904 to December 1909 and from October 1912 to July 1913; in 1904 it was published fortnightly and then monthly. p. 192

[241] *The City and Gubernia Conference of the St. Petersburg Organisation of the R.S.D.L.P.* met at Terioki on January 6 (19), 1907. It was attended by 70 delegates with vote (42 Bolsheviks and 28 Mensheviks). Four representatives of the Menshevik C.C. and C.O., one representative each from the St. Petersburg Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. and from the Editorial Board of the Bolshevik newspaper *Proletary*, and others attended with voice only. When the credentials were verified, it turned out that in some subdistricts, mainly represented by the Mensheviks, there had been breaches of the resolution of the St. Petersburg Committee requiring

that elections of delegates to the Conference should be held only after discussions by Party members of the question of whether agreements with the Cadets ought to be concluded. The Conference regarded such credentials as invalid. It rejected the proposal motioned by the representative of the C.C. that the Conference should be divided into two sections (the city and the gubernia) in accordance with the existing electoral districts, for the proposal was aimed at giving the Mensheviks an artificial superiority at the Conference. The Mensheviks used this decision as a pretext for breaking with the revolutionary Social-Democrats and making a deal with the Cadets; they walked out, splitting the St. Petersburg organisation on the eve of the election.

The other delegates decided to continue the Conference. Lenin gave the report on Duma-electoral agreements, and after a debate the Conference affirmed the "Minority Opinion" entered by the Bolsheviks at the Second (First All-Russia) Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (pp. 188-91). The Conference rejected the idea of forming a bloc with the Cadets and decided to propose to the S.R.s and the Trudoviks an agreement for the election period, provided they repudiated the idea of any alliance with the Cadets.

The Conference was described in detail in Lenin's "The Social-Democrats and the Duma Elections", "'When You Hear the Judgement of a Fool' ... (From the Notes of a Social-Democratic Publicist)", "The Workers' Party Election Campaign in St. Petersburg", "The Social-Democratic Election Campaign in St. Petersburg", "The Protest of the Thirty-One Mensheviks" et al. (see present edition, Vol. 11, pp. 431-55, 456-74, 426-30; Vol. 12, pp. 15-23, 29-32). p. 193

[242] The note was published in the "Press Review" section in No. 7 of the newspaper *Novy Luch* (New Ray) on February 27, 1907, in reply to Martov's feuilleton "This Is the Limit", which appeared in No. 48 of *Russkaya Zhizn* on February 25 (March 10), 1907. p. 196

[243] *Russkaya Zhizn* (Russian Life)—a legal Left Cadet daily published in St. Petersburg from January 1 (14), 1907. From its No. 38 of February 14 (27), the paper passed into the hands of the Mensheviks. Among those who wrote for it were P. B. Axelrod, F. I. Dan, V. I. Zasulich, L. Martov and G. V. Plekhanov. It was closed down on March 2 (15). p. 196

[244] *The Fifth Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.* was held in London from April 30 to May 19 (May 13 to June 1), 1907. It was attended by 336 delegates representing more than 147,000 members: 105 Bolsheviks, 97 Mensheviks, 57 Bundists, 44 Polish Social-Democrats, 29 members of the Social-Democracy of the Latvian Territory, and 4 "non-faction" delegates. The large industrial centres were represented by Bolsheviks. The St. Petersburg Party organisation sent 12 Bolsheviks of its 17 delegates; the Moscow City and Moscow District, 16 out of 19; the Urals, 19; Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Vladimir, Kostroma District, Bryansk, Kazan and Krasnoyarsk, Bolsheviks only. Lenin was a delegate to the Congress from the Upper

Kama organisation. At the Congress there was a well-knit group of Bolsheviks led by Lenin, among them A. S. Bubnov, I. F. Dubrovinsky, M. N. Lyadov, V. P. Nogin, M. N. Pokrovsky, K. N. Samoilova, S. G. Shahumyan, J. V. Stalin, A. M. Stopani, I. A. Teodorovich, M. G. Tskhakaya, K. Y. Voroshilov, and Y. M. Yaroslavsky. Maxim Gorky attended the Congress with voice only. Following a long and sharp debate the Congress adopted this agenda: 1) Report of the Central Committee. 2) Report of the Duma group and its set-up. 3) Attitude to the bourgeois parties. 4) The Duma. 5) "Labour congress" and non-Party labour organisations. 6) Trade unions and the Party. 7) Partisan action. 8) Unemployment, economic crisis and lockouts. 9) Organisational questions. 10) International Congress at Stuttgart (May Day, militarism). 11) Work in the army. 12) Miscellaneous. In view of the work of the Congress being protracted, the questions of unemployment, of the economic crisis and the lockouts, and the International Congress at Stuttgart were taken off the agenda.

Lenin was elected to the presidium of the Congress and chaired the 6th, 7th, 14th, 15th, 27th, 34th and 35th sittings; he gave the report and delivered the summing-up speech on the key item of the agenda—the attitude to the bourgeois parties; he also spoke on the C.C. report on its work, the report on the Duma group activity, for inclusion in the agenda of the general theoretical questions of the principles underlying the Party's tactics in the bourgeois revolution, against the Mensheviks, the Bundists and Trotsky (see present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 437-88).

At the Congress the Bolsheviks were supported by the delegates of the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania and the Social-Democrats of the Latvian Territory. Having rallied them on a revolutionary platform, the Bolsheviks secured a majority and a victory for the revolutionary Marxist line. The Congress adopted Bolshevik resolutions on all major questions. It amended the Party Rules, eliminating the two-centre arrangement (election of the C.C. and the C.O by the congress). Under the amended Rules, only the C.C was elected, while the C.O. was to be appointed by the C.C. and was to work under its control. The Rules provided for periodical Party conferences to discuss the most important aspects of Party life.

To the Central Committee were elected five Bolsheviks, four Mensheviks, two Polish Social-Democrats and one Latvian Social-Democrat; ten Bolsheviks, seven Mensheviks, three Polish and two Latvian Social-Democrats were elected alternate members. Among the Bolsheviks elected to the C.C as full and alternate members were V. I. Lenin, I. F. Dubrovinsky, F. E. Dzerzhinsky, L. B. Krasin, J. Marchlewski, V. P. Nogin and L. Tyszka. Three more persons were subsequently nominated for the C.C.: two from the Bund and one from the Latvian Social-Democrats.

As the C.C. leadership could not be reliable, for it consisted of representatives of different trends (those of the non-Russian Social-Democratic organisations frequently vacillated between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks), a Bolshevik Centre headed

by Lenin was elected at a sitting of the Bolshevik group towards the end of the Congress. It included the Editorial Board of the newspaper *Proletary*.

The Fifth Congress marked a triumph for Bolshevism in the working-class movement of Russia. Its decisions summed up the victory of Bolshevism over the opportunist, Menshevik wing of the Party during the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The Bolshevik tactics was approved as the common one for the whole Party. p. 197

[245] Lenin spoke at the third sitting. Following the adoption of the first two items of the agenda, 1. Report of the Central Committee, and 2. Report of the Duma group and its set-up, the Bundist Zeltser (B. N. Grosser) joined Lieber in motioning that there should be no debate on the general theoretical questions of principle, motioned for inclusion in the agenda (items 3, 4 and 5 of the Bolshevik draft agenda—the aggravation of the economic struggle and the current situation, the class tasks of the proletariat at the present stage, and the attitude to the bourgeois parties). The Bundist Vinitsky (V. D. Medem) who was in the chair motioned a closure of the debate.

After Lenin's speech at the following, fourth, sitting, the debate on the inclusion of the general theoretical questions in the agenda was continued. At the fifth sitting on May 2 (15), the item "On the Attitude to the Bourgeois Parties" was included in the agenda. p. 197

[246] Point 4 of the regulations adopted by the Congress provided for a name-ticket vote only when at least 20 delegates demanded one. Lenin spoke in connection with the fact that a proposal had been made to the presidium of the Congress to have the roll-call vote without tickets. By 3 votes to 2 the presidium came out against the tickets, but in view of the differences that arose, the question was referred to the Congress. A majority (144) were in favour of the name-ticket vote. p. 197

[247] Lieber's amendment opened the attack by the Menshevik-Bundist opportunist section of the Congress against the Bolshevik resolution on the attitude to the bourgeois parties, which had been adopted as a basis. Lieber motioned the deletion of the first part of the theoretical resolution: "At present, Social-Democracy is most insistently faced with the task of determining the class content of the various non-proletarian parties, of taking account of the present interrelation of classes and accordingly of defining its attitude to the other parties". Lieber's amendment was rejected by the Congress. For the amendments to the resolution on "The Attitude Towards Bourgeois Parties", see present edition, Vol. 12, pp. 500-05. p. 198

[248] Lenin is replying to F. I. Dan, who objected to designating the Congress as the Fifth, as the Bolsheviks had proposed, on the plea that it was an effort to fix the factional dissensions. Actually, however, the Mensheviks and the Bundists had ignored the Third,

Bolshevik, Congress. The Congress adopted the proposal of the Bundist Shanin (L. G. Shapiro) to designate it as the "London Congress of the R.S.D.L.P." p. 199

[249] The draft resolution of the Second Congress of the Social-Democracy of the Latvian Territory, "*On the Tasks of the Proletariat of the Current State of the Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution*", written by Lenin, was annexed, without debate, to the minutes of the Congress and published in No. 78 of the newspaper *Zihņa* on July 7, 1907. The minutes of the Congress have not been preserved.

The Second Congress of the Social-Democracy of the Latvian Territory was held in London from May 21 to 25 (June 3 to 7), 1907, just after the Fifth (London) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. By then there were almost 13,000 organised Party members. The Congress was attended by 26 delegates with vote and 10 with voice only. The agenda was: 1) Reports of the Central Committee, of the Auditing Committee and local organisations. 2) Crises, lockouts and unemployment. 3) On the tasks of the proletariat at the present moment of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. 4) On agitation in the army. 5) On the trade unions. 6) On propaganda and agitation. 7) Organisational questions, etc. The agrarian question had been removed from the agenda, evidence of the erroneous attitude of the Latvian Social-Democrats.

At the Congress there was a sharp struggle between the revolutionary Social-Democrats and the opportunists, especially on the C.C. report.

Lenin took an active part in the work of the Congress. At the afternoon sitting on May 24 (June 6), 1907, he gave a report on the tasks of the proletariat at the present moment of the bourgeois-democratic revolution (there is a very bad record of the report—a retranslation from the Latvian into Russian made at the Police Department). The Congress showed that Bolshevism had won strong positions in Latvia: it adopted Bolshevik decisions on the question of the trade unions, unemployment, and democratic and military organisations.

The Congress elected a new Central Committee, consisting in the main of revolutionary Social-Democrats, and authorised the C.C. to publish a manifesto "To the Latvian Proletariat", drawn up in the Bolshevik spirit.

Zihņa (*Ciņa*) (Struggle)—the Central Organ of the Latvian Social-Democrats, founded in March 1904. It was published illegally in Riga at big intervals until August 1909, and then abroad. On the occasion of its hundredth issue in 1910, it carried an article by Lenin, "The Jubilee Number of *Zihņa*", giving a high appraisal of the revolutionary activity of the Latvian Social-Democrats (see present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 260-64). The paper also carried a number of Party documents written by Lenin. Among its constant and active contributors were P. I. Stučka, one of the organisers of the Communist Party of Latvia, and the popular poet J. Rainis.

From April 1917, the newspaper was published legally in Petrograd, Riga and elsewhere, and from August 1919, when the

counter-revolution temporarily won out in Latvia, it was again published illegally in Riga. After the establishment of the Soviet power in June 1940, the paper became the organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia and the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Republic. p. 199

[250] *The International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart* (the Seventh Congress of the Second International) was held from August 18 to 24, 1907.

The Congress was attended by 886 delegates representing socialist parties and trade unions. The German delegation was especially numerous (289 persons), most of them trade union officials, a fact which had a strong effect on the stand of the German Social-Democratic Party in the discussion and adoption of the Congress resolutions.

The delegation from Russia consisted of 37 Social-Democrats, 21 S.R.s and 7 trade unionists. On the Bolshevik delegation were V. I. Lenin, A. A. Bogdanov, I. P. Goldenberg (Meshkovsky), B. A. Knunyants, M. M. Litvinov, A. V. Lunacharsky, N. A. Semashko and M. Tskhakaya.

The Congress examined the following questions: 1) Militarism and international conflicts. 2) Relations between political parties and trade unions. 3) Colonial question. 4) Immigration and emigration of workers. 5) Women's suffrage.

Lenin held several conferences of Bolshevik delegates to define their line in the Social-Democratic section, in the Russia delegation and at the Congress; he took part in the meetings of the Social-Democratic section, where he fought the opportunist line of the Mensheviks, and in the meetings of the Russia delegation, where he defended the R.S.D.L.P. stand against the S.R.s.

During the Congress, Lenin carried out a great deal of work in uniting the Left-wing forces in international Social-Democracy, resolutely fighting the opportunists and revisionists. The conferences he organised with Left-wingers (Clara Zetkin, Rosa Luxemburg, Leon Tyszka, Georg Ledebour and others) were the first step in rallying the revolutionary Marxists.

The work of the Congress was concentrated in the committees, which drafted the resolutions for the Plenary Meetings. Lenin took part in the work of the committee on "Militarism and International Conflicts". In the discussion of the draft resolution motioned by August Bebel, Lenin proposed amendments, which were supported by the Polish Social-Democrats, and secured a basic change in the draft in the spirit of revolutionary Marxism.

There was an acute struggle on the colonial question. The opportunist majority of the committee, headed by the Dutch "socialist" Van Kol, motioned an opportunist draft resolution which was supported by a majority of the German delegation. The resolution on the colonial question adopted by the Congress denounced all colonial policy straightforwardly and without reservations.

The Congress adopted a resolution on the immigration and emigration of workers, which met the demands of the revolutionary

Social-Democrats, and of the internationalist education of workers in all countries.

Lenin attached great importance to the adoption by the Congress of a resolution on the relations between the trade unions and the political party of the working class. In the committee Lenin's line on the partisanship of the trade unions was supported by A. V. Lunacharsky. On this question, contrary to the efforts of the Right wing, the Congress adopted a resolution confirming the principle of partisanship of the trade unions.

For Lenin's articles on the Stuttgart Congress see present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 75-93. p. 200

[251] At the Stuttgart Congress, Lenin first met and got to know Clara Zetkin, who, together with other Left-wing German Social-Democrats, stood up for the tactics of revolutionary Marxism, and opposed the opportunists and revisionists.

A translation of Clara Zetkin's article "International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart" was edited by Lenin, who also supplied the notes, explaining the questions on which there had been a struggle against the opportunist section of the Congress delegates.

Clara Zetkin's article was published in the Bolshevik miscellany *Zarnitsy* (Summer Lightning). p. 201

[252] *Die Gleichheit* (Equality)—a Social-Democratic fortnightly, an organ of the women's labour movement in Germany, and then of the international women's movement; published at Stuttgart from 1890 to 1925; from 1892 to 1917 it was edited by Clara Zetkin. p. 201

[253] *Tovarishch* (Comrade)—a bourgeois daily published in St. Petersburg from March 15 (28), 1906, to December 30, 1907 (January 12, 1908). The paper was nominally independent, but was in fact an organ of the Left-wing Cadets. Among those who worked closely with the paper were S. N. Prokopovich and Y. D. Kuskova. Mensheviks also contributed to the paper. p. 202

[254] *Znamya Truda* (Banner of Labour)—the Central Organ of the S. R. Party published in Paris from July 1907 to April 1914. p. 207

[255] *The International Socialist Bureau* (I.S.B.)—the standing executive and information organ of the Second International; the decision to set up the I.S.B., consisting of representatives of the socialist parties of all countries, was adopted at the Paris Congress of the Second International in September 1900. G. V. Plekhanov and B. N. Krichevsky were the Russian Social-Democrats elected to the I.S.B. From 1905, Lenin was the R.S.D.L.P. representative on the I.S.B. In the I.S.B., Lenin carried on a resolute struggle against the opportunist leaders of the Second International. The I.S.B. wound up its activities in 1914. p. 207

[256] *Khlestakov*—a liar and boaster in Nikolai Gogol's comedy *The Inspector-General*. p. 208

[257] *French Radicals and Radical-Socialists*—a bourgeois party in

France, formalised, in 1901, actually existing since the 1880s. Until the First World War (1914-18), it mainly represented the interests of the petty and middle bourgeoisie; in the inter-war period, the influence of the big bourgeoisie increased in the party whose leaders have repeatedly headed the French Government. p. 209

[258] *The Third Duma* held five sessions from November 1 (14), 1907, to June 9 (22), 1912. Elected on the basis of the June 3 electoral law the Third Duma was dominated by the Black Hundreds and the Octobrists, and was a pliant tool of the tsarist government in its counter-revolutionary policy of violence and repression against the revolutionary forces of Russia.

At the opening of the first session there were 11 parties and groups, including: Right-wing (extreme Right-wing, nationalist and moderate Right-wing)—147 deputies; Octobrists—154; Polish-Lithuanian-Byelorussian group—7; Polish kolo—11; Progressive group—28; Moslem group—8; Cadets—54; Trudovik group—14; and Social-Democrats—19.

The Social-Democratic group in the Third Duma, despite the very difficult conditions, the small size of the group and some initial mistakes, did a great deal, thanks to the presence of the Bolshevik deputies, in exposing the anti-popular policy of the Third Duma, and in the political education of the proletariat and peasantry of Russia, through speeches in the Duma and work outside it. p. 209

[259] *The Electoral Law of December 11* (*24*), *1905*, on the convocation of a "legislative" Duma was issued by the tsarist government at the height of the Moscow armed uprising. It assured the landowners and capitalists of overriding domination in the Duma. The First Duma, elected under the law, was a Cadet one. p. 209

[260] *Octobrists*—members of the Octobrist Party (or the Union of October Seventeen) formed in Russia after the issue of the tsar's manifesto of October 17 (30), 1905. It was a counter-revolutionary party representing and fighting for the interests of the big bourgeoisie and landowners engaged in capitalist operations; it was headed by the well-known Moscow industrialist and real-estate man A. I. Guchkov and the big landowner M. V. Rodzyanko. The Octobrists gave full support to the tsarist government's domestic and foreign policy. p. 209

[261] *Union of the Russian People*—an ultra-reactionary, diehard organisation of monarchists, formed in St. Petersburg in October 1905 to fight the revolutionary movement. It had branches in many towns of Russia.

The Union wanted to preserve the autocracy, semi-feudal landed estates and privileges for the gentry. "Orthodoxy, Autocracy National Character", the nationalistic slogan of the serf period, was its programme slogan. Its chief methods of fighting the revolution were pogroms and assassinations.

After the dispersal of the Second Duma, the Union broke up into two organisations: the Chamber of St. Michael the Archan-

gel, led by Purishkevich, which called for the use of the Third Duma for counter-revolutionary ends, and the Union of the Russian People itself, led by Dubrovin, which continued the tactics of open terrorism. Both outfits were liquidated during the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917. After the October Socialist Revolution, former members of these outfits took an active part in counter-revolutionary revolts and plots against the Soviet power. p. 212

[262] *A Plenary Meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee* was held at Geneva from August 11 to 13 (24 to 26), 1908, and was attended by 12 persons, five Bolsheviks (V. I. Lenin, I. F. Dubrovinsky and V. K. Taratuta among them), three Mensheviks, one Latvian Social-Democrat, one Polish Social-Democrat and two Bundists. On the agenda were these questions: 1) report on the convocation of the Plenary Meeting; 2) all-Russia conference; 3) Central Bureau Abroad and promotion groups; 4) organisation of the Central Committee; 5) financial matters; 6) report of the C.C. to the Stuttgart Congress; and 7) current business.

At the Plenary Meeting the Bolsheviks administered a resolute rebuff to the Menshevik efforts to do away with the Party's Central Committee and to frustrate the convocation of a Party conference. The Plenary Meeting adopted decisions on the main items of the agenda as motioned by the Bolsheviks. On Lenin's proposal, it was decided to start work right away on the convocation of a conference, whose agenda was outlined. The Plenary Meeting adopted Bolshevik resolutions on the organisation of the Central Committee and on the establishment of a Central Bureau Abroad, the latter being based on Lenin's "Draft Resolution on the Organisation of the Central Bureau Abroad" (pp. 217-18). Lenin was elected to the C.O. Editorial Board from the Bolsheviks.

The report on the convocation of the Plenary Meeting was discussed together with the question of organising the Central Committee, for it was learned during the debate that the Mensheviks had been in correspondence with the Bund and that they had actually proposed to liquidate the C.C. as the Party's governing body under the pretext of "reorganising" it. At the Plenary Meeting itself, the Mensheviks and the Bundists tried hard to cover up the fact. It was in this connection that Lenin handed in his special "Statement on the Convocation of the C.C. Plenary Meeting" and motioned the "Draft Resolution on the Incident over the Convocation of the C.C. Plenary Meeting" which the Plenary Meeting adopted (pp. 216, 217).

After the Plenary Meeting, the Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, started a broad campaign in preparation for an all-Russia Party conference. p. 216

[263] *The R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee Bureau Abroad* (*C.C.B.A.*) was set up by the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee Plenary Meeting in August 1908 as a three-man body representing the Party abroad under the Central Committee's Bureau in Russia. Its duty was to maintain contacts with the Central Committee in Russia

and its members working abroad, supervise the activity of R.S.D.L.P. promotion groups abroad and their Central Bureau, collect dues for the C.C. fund from organisations abroad and organise the collection of money for the Central Committee. In order to unite all the promotion groups abroad and to subordinate them to a single general Party leadership the August 1908 Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee authorised the C.C.B.A. to hold a special congress of these groups, which it failed to do in 1909 because of stubborn resistance from the Central Bureau of the promotion groups abroad, where the Menshevik liquidators were in control. The January 1910 Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee reorganised the C.C.B.A. and limited its role in directing the Party's general affairs, correspondingly increasing that of the Central Committee Bureau in Russia. The C.C.B.A. was to have five members, three of them representing the Central Committees of non-Russian national organisations. A stable liquidationist majority was formed in the Central Committee Bureau Abroad, and it did everything to disrupt the work of the central Party bodies. Its anti-Party stand was most clearly revealed in the systematic obstruction to the calling of a C.C. Plenary Meeting, which the Bolsheviks were trying to secure in view of the liquidators' failure to fulfill the decisions of the C.C.'s January Plenary Meeting. The C.C.B.A.'s liquidationist tactics made the Bolshevik representative Semashko resign from the C.C.B.A. in May 1911.

The meeting of R.S.D.L.P. C.C. members called in Paris in June 1911 adopted a decision condemning the C.C.B.A.'s political line and referred the question of its continued existence to the next Plenary Meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee.

In November 1911, the Polish Social-Democratic representative was recalled from the C.C.B.A., and he was followed by the Latvian Social-Democrat. The C.C.B.A. dissolved itself in January 1912. p. 217

[264] *The Fifth All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.* was held in Paris from December 21 to 27, 1908 (January 3 to 9, 1909). It was attended by 16 delegates with vote, among them five Bolsheviks, three Mensheviks, five Polish Social-Democrats and three Bundists. On the agenda were the following questions: 1) Reports of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee, the Central Committee of the Polish Social-Democrats, the Bund Central Committee, the St. Petersburg organisation, the Moscow, Central Industrial Region, Urals and Caucasian organisations. 2) The present political situation and the Party's tasks. 3) The Social-Democratic Duma group. 4) Organisational questions in connection with the changed political conditions. 5) Local mergers with non-Russian organisations. 6) Affairs abroad. On every question, the Bolsheviks conducted a relentless struggle against the Menshevik liquidators and their supporters. The Conference resolution "On the Reports" sharply condemned liquidationism as an opportunist trend and called for the most resolute ideological and organisational struggle against any attempts to liquidate the Party.

The work of the Conference was centred on Lenin's report "On the Present Moment and the Tasks of the Party". The Mensheviks

tried in vain to get the item on the agenda. The Conference adopted the resolution motioned by Lenin with slight amendments (see present edition, Vol. 15, pp. 321-24).

The resolution "On the Social-Democratic Group in the Duma", motioned by the Bolsheviks, criticised the activity of the group and stated its concrete tasks. The Mensheviks objected to any indication of the Duma group's mistakes in the Conference decisions and opposed the Central Committee's right of veto in respect of the group. The otzovists also came out against the Leninist line in respect of the Duma group. The Conference adopted the Bolshevik resolution, whose text included a part of Lenin's second variant of "Practical Instructions on Voting for the Budget by the Social-Democratic Group in the Duma" and all of his "Addendum to the Resolution on 'The Social-Democratic Group in the Duma'" (see present edition, Vol. 15, pp. 326-27, 328). During the discussion of the organisational question, the Bolsheviks proposed a draft resolution stating that the Party should devote special attention to the establishment and strengthening of illegal Party organisations, making use of an extensive network of diverse legal societies for work among the masses. The Mensheviks were actually trying to liquidate the illegal Party and stop all revolutionary work. In his speech on the organisational question, Lenin sharply criticised the resolution of the Menshevik liquidators and their attempts to justify those who had deserted from the Party in the years of reaction. The Conference adopted Lenin's "Directives for the Committee on Questions of Organisation" (see present edition Vol. 15, p. 355) and set up a committee to draft a resolution. The committee, and then the Conference itself, adopted the Bolshevik draft resolution. The Conference's resolution on the local merger of national organisations resolutely rejected the principle of federalism, which the Bundists supported, as they wanted workers in the Party to be compartmentalised on national lines. During the discussion of the Central Committee's work, the Mensheviks proposed that its seat should be transferred to Russia and that the C.C. Bureau Abroad should be eliminated. The liquidationist draft resolutions were rejected. The Conference adopted a resolution recognising "the existence abroad of a general Party representative body in the form of the Central Committee Bureau Abroad as being useful and necessary". A Bolshevik resolution was adopted on the Central Organ; the Conference rejected the Menshevik proposal to have the publication of the C.O. transferred to Russia.

The Bolsheviks won a great victory at the Conference in their struggle against the Menshevik liquidators. The Conference decisions also dealt a blow at the otzovists. In the years of reaction, the Party was guided by the decisions of this Conference. Lenin said that the Fifth All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. "has led the Party out on to the road, and evidently marks a turning-point in the development of the Russian working-class movement after the victory of the counter-revolution" (see present edition, Vol. 15, p. 345). p. 218

[265] On the strength of the short record of Lenin's speech, it is impossible to say how fully his speech on the organisational question on December 24, 1908 (January 6, 1909) reflected all the questions listed in the outline, but these suggest that it may have been written during the debate on the organisational question. p. 218

[266] A reference to the Party's twelve-man Central Committee elected at the Fifth (London) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., the five meaning its narrow group working in Russia. Lenin's ironical quip about the "angelic order" of the five seems to refer to the draft resolution of the Menshevik liquidators proposing to eliminate the C.C. Bureau Abroad and concentrate all Party guidance in the hands of the five in Russia. p. 218

[267] Lenin made the statement at the Conference on December 24 1908 (January 6, 1909), after the slanderous statement by a member of the Caucasian delegation, the Menshevik N. Ramishvili (Pyotr). It became known at the Central Committee Plenary Meeting in August 1908 that the Menshevik liquidators had tried, even before the Plenary Meeting, to have the C.C. eliminated as the governing body of the Party and its activity confined to the functions of information. The plan to eliminate the C.C. was set out in a letter addressed in June 1908 by B. Gorev, a member of the C C., and A. Martynov a member of the *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* Editorial Board, "To All Menshevik Organisations". At the Plenary Meeting itself the Mensheviks tried hard to cover up their intention to liquidate the C.C. (pp. 216-17). The Bolsheviks exposed the disorganising, anti-Party activity of the liquidators. The C.C. Plenary Meeting adopted Bolshevik draft resolutions on all the main items of the agenda. At the Fifth All-Russia Conference members of the *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* Editorial Board Dan and Axelrod and C.C. member N. Ramishvili, who had credentials from the Caucasian organisation, took a common, extreme liquidationist stand. p. 219

[268] *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* (The Voice of the Social-Democrat)—the Menshevik organ abroad, first published in Geneva and then in Paris from February 1908 to December 1911. Its editors were P. B. Axelrod, F. I. Dan, L. Martov, A. Martynov and G. V. Plekhanov. From its first issue, the paper stood up for the liquidators, justifying their anti-Party activity. Following Plekhanov's withdrawal from the Editorial Board over the paper's liquidationist stand, it crystallised as the ideological centre of liquidationism. p. 219

[269] Lenin entered his statement of fact at the last, ninth, sitting of the Conference on December 26, 1908 (January 8, 1909). The minutes show that the sitting continued its discussion of the resolution on the Social-Democratic Duma group. During the discussion of the point on budget voting, Lenin motioned his wording of this part of the resolution (see present edition, Vol. 15, pp. 326-27). In the minutes there is an amendment by M. N. Lyadov proposing that the end of the resolution "and trade union organisations"

should be worded as "after exchange of opinion with representatives of the trade unions". Lyadov said this was necessary because the draft resolution under discussion tended to narrow down the Central Committee's powers. Lenin opposed Lyadov's amendment, saying that the C.C. had the right of veto in respect of the Social-Democratic Duma group. Lyadov's amendment was rejected. The decision on the C.C.'s right of veto in respect of the Duma group was adopted at the same sitting. It said that in view of its responsibility for the work of the group the C.C. must use its right of veto unhesitatingly "where the group's decisions threaten to harm the Party". p. 220

[270] Lenin motioned the statement at the Conference on December 26, 1908 (January 8, 1909) during the discussion of the resolution on the Central Committee's work. The Menshevik liquidators had tried to liquidate the Central Committee as the Party's governing body even before the Central Committee's Plenary Meeting in August 1908. Accordingly, Lenin motioned his "Statement on the Convocation of the C.C. Plenary Meeting" at the Plenary Meeting on August 12 (25), 1908 (p. 216). The resolution "On the Incident over the Convocation of the C.C. Plenary Meeting" was adopted the following day on Lenin's motion (p. 217). p. 220

[271] The plan was written in 1908 or 1909, but the Institute of Marxism-Leninism has no direct information on those lectures. Those who were there recall that Lenin read some lectures on philosophy in the Bolshevik circle in Paris in early 1909. Mention of industry in 1907 is an indication that the plan was written later than 1907, since the statistical data for that year could not have been available before the beginning of the following one.

The reference to "present-day opportunists (Bogdanov)" in point 6 of the section "Philosophical Materialism" implies that the plan was written not earlier than the second half of March 1908, just when (not later than April 3 [16]) Lenin had sent to the press his article "Marxism and Revisionism", in which he made his first press attack on Bogdanov for his opportunist, revisionist views in philosophy. Almost all the points of the section "Philosophical Materialism" are reflected in his book "*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*"; some points of the section "The Agrarian Question" are dealt with in his works on the agrarian question written in 1908. p. 221

[272] The Conference was called on Lenin's initiative, and was held in Paris from June 8 to 17 (21 to 30), 1909. It was attended by nine members of the Bolshevik Centre, the supreme body of the Bolshevik group, elected by the Bolshevik delegates at the Fifth (London) Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.; representatives of the St. Petersburg, Moscow Region and Urals organisations were also there. It was held under Lenin's guidance, and his speeches on all the main items of the agenda determined the character of its work. The otzovists, ultimatumists and god-builders were represented by A. Bogdanov (Maximov) and

V. L. Shantser (Marat), who were supported by V. M. Shulyatikov (Donat), representing the Moscow Region organisation. On several questions G. Y. Zinoviev, L. B. Kamenev, A. I. Rykov and M. P. Tomsky took a conciliatory stand.

The Conference discussed the following questions: otzovism and ultimatumism; god-building tendencies among Social-Democrats; attitude to the activity in the Duma among the other branches of Party work; the tasks of the Bolsheviks in the Party; the Party school being set up on Capri; unity of the group; the agitation for a Bolshevik Congress or a Bolshevik conference separate from the Party; the split-away of A. Bogdanov, and other questions. Lenin gave detailed information on the state of affairs in the Party and the Bolshevik group. His propositions became the basis of decisions adopted by the Conference.

The Conference resolutely condemned otzovism-ultimatumism as a harmful and dangerous trend within the working-class movement; it sharply criticised the philosophical views of the otzovists-ultimatumists, which were especially strikingly revealed in the idea of god-building. Bogdanov, the leader and ideologist of the otzovists, ultimatumists and god-builders, who had made an attempt on the unity of the Bolshevik group and had taken the way of revising Marxism and substituting for it an idealist, reactionary philosophy, was expelled from the Bolshevik group.

The Conference decisions were of great importance for the whole Party. Lenin said that they gave great harmony and completeness to the political line which had been worked out by the Party in the years of reaction. For details about the Conference see present edition, Vol. 15, pp. 425-51. p. 222

[273] The resolution motioned by Stanislav ("Yer", S. Volsky—A. V. Sokolov) in the Moscow Committee expressed no confidence in the Editorial Board of *Proletary* and called for a Bolshevik conference to elect a new ideological centre. The Moscow Committee rejected the resolution "by every vote except his own" (see present edition Vol. 16, p. 53). The text of the resolution has not been discovered. p. 223

[274] *Otzovists*—representatives of an opportunist trend among the Bolsheviks. Behind a screen of revolutionary talk, the otzovists (A. Bogdanov, G. A. Alexinsky, A. V. Sokolov [S. Volsky], A. V. Lunacharsky, M. N. Lyadov and others) demanded the recall of the Social-Democratic deputies from the Third Duma and an end to work in legal organisations. They held that in the conditions of reaction the Party should conduct illegal activity only, and refused to participate in the Duma, in the workers' trade unions, co-operatives and other mass legal and semi-legal organisations. Ultimatumism was a variety of otzovism. The ultimatumists differed from the otzovists only in form. They proposed presenting the Social-Democratic Duma group with an ultimatum that it should implicitly submit to the Party Central Committee's decisions and should be recalled from the Duma in the event of noncompliance. Ultimatumism was in fact a camouflaged

otzovism, and Lenin said the ultimatumists were "bashful otzovists".

The otzovists were doing the Party a great deal of harm. Their policy could lead to the Party's separation from the masses and its transformation into a sectarian organisation incapable of mustering forces for another revolutionary upsurge. Lenin exposed the otzovists as "liquidators inside out", and declared a relentless fight against them. He wrote: "Otzovism is *not* Bolshevism but the worst political travesty of Bolshevism its worst political enemy could invent" (see present edition, Vol. 15, p. 357). p. 223

[275] *The Third* (*Second All-Russia*) *Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.* was held at Kotka, Finland, from July 21 to 23 (August 3 to 5), 1907. It was attended by 26 delegates, nine of them Bolsheviks, five Mensheviks, five Polish Social-Democrats, five Bundists and two Latvian Social-Democrats. Among the delegates were V. I. Lenin, F. E. Dzerzhinsky, A. V. Lunacharsky and Rosa Luxemburg. The Conference was also attended by members and alternate members of the Party Central Committee elected at the Fifth (London) Congress. The need to call an urgent conference (two months after the Fifth Congress) was due to the changed political situation in view of the Third of June counter-revolutionary coup and the elections to the Third Duma. On the agenda of the Conference were the following questions: participation in the elections to the Third Duma, electoral agreements with other parties, electoral platform and the All-Russia Congress of Trade Unions.

On the first question, the Conference heard three reports: Lenin's (against a boycott) and A. Bogdanov's (for a boycott) from the Bolsheviks, and F. Dan's, from the Mensheviks and the Bund. The Conference adopted as a basis Lenin's draft resolution calling on the Party to take part in the electoral campaign and to struggle both against the Rightist parties and against the Cadets (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh...*, Part I, pp. 173-74). When their resolution was rejected, the Bolsheviks favouring a boycott voted for Lenin's resolution.

The Conference decided that at the first stage of the elections, the Social-Democrats should not enter into any agreements with other parties, agreements being allowed on second and subsequent ballots with all parties left of the Cadets. At the second and subsequent stages of the elections, agreements could be reached with all revolutionary and opposition parties to fight the Rightists. But in the workers' curia, the Social-Democrats were not to enter into agreements with other parties, with the exception of national Social-Democratic parties outside the R.S.D.L.P., and also the P.P.S. The Conference invited the Central Committee to draw up the electoral platform on the basis of its resolution on participation in the elections to the Third Duma. The Conference heard two reports on the All-Russia Congress of Trade Unions: one for the principle of the partisanship of the trade unions, and another, for the trade unions remaining neutral. There were four draft resolutions on the reports (a Bolshevik, a Menshevik, and two compromise resolutions). The Conference decided to refer them

to the R.S.D.L P. Central Committee. The Bolshevik draft resolution was based on the draft proposed by Lenin (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh...*, Part I, p. 180).

The importance of the Third Conference lies in the fact that it marked out the principles of the Party's tactics in the new historical situation—the period of the Stolypin reaction. p. 223

[276] *Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P.* (*C.O.*)— the illegal newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat* published from February 1908 to January 1917. The first issue prepared by the Bolsheviks and partly printed by a private printer at Vilno was confiscated by the tsarist secret police. Soon another attempt was made to publish the newspaper in St. Petersburg. The bulk of the printing likewise fell into the hands of the gendarmes. Subsequently, the paper was published abroad: Nos. 2-32 (February 1909-December 1913) in Paris; Nos. 33-58 (November 1914-January 1917) in Geneva. There were altogether 58 issues, of which five had supplements. Lenin was the actual editor of the paper, and his articles were the centre-pieces of the newspaper. More than 80 articles and items by Lenin appeared in *Sotsial-Demokrat*. p. 224

[277] *The pro-Party Mensheviks*, headed by G. V. Plekhanov, opposed the liquidators in the years of reaction. While retaining their Menshevik positions, the Plekhanovites wanted the illegal Party organisation preserved and strengthened, and on that point favoured a bloc with the Bolsheviks. Lenin urged the Bolsheviks to move nearer to the pro-Party Mensheviks, saying that there could be an agreement with them on the basis of a struggle for the Party, and against the liquidators, "...without any ideological compromises, without any glossing over of tactical and other differences of opinion *within the limits* of the Party line" (see present edition, Vol. 16, p. 101). The pro-Party Mensheviks joined the Bolsheviks in working in the local Party committees, and contributed to Bolshevik publications. At the end of 1911, Plekhanov broke up the bloc with the Bolsheviks. On the pretext of fighting the "factionalism" and the split within the R.S.D.L.P., he tried to reconcile the Bolsheviks and the opportunists. In 1912, the Plekhanovites joined the Trotskyites, Bundists and liquidators in opposing the decisions of the Prague Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. p. 224

[278] A reference to A. Bogdanov's speech in the debate on the report on otzovism and ultimatumism, which said that Rosa Luxemburg had sharply condemned both. In an effort to cast doubt on her criticism, Bogdanov recalled that in 1904 and 1905 Rosa Luxemburg had opposed the Bolsheviks. p. 225

[279] The school was set up in 1909 on the isle of Capri, Italy, by the otzovists, ultimatumists and god-builders. The conference of the enlarged Editorial Board of *Proletary* exposed the factional anti-Bolshevik character of the school, stating that its organisers were pursuing "not aims common to the Bolshevik wing as a whole, as an ideological trend in the Party, but the private aims of a group with a separate ideology and policy". The school was reso-

lutely condemned as a "new centre being formed for a faction breaking away from the Bolsheviks" (see present edition, Vol. 15, p. 450).

It was opened in August. Lectures were given by A. Bogdanov, G. Alexinsky, A. Lunacharsky, Maxim Gorky, M. N. Lyadov M. N. Pokrovsky and V. A. Desnitsky. Lenin rejected a formal invitation to go and lecture at the school. In a letter to its students, who were insisting that he read them a series of lectures, Lenin said that he could not do so because the school had been "*deliberately hidden away from the Party*" in a "remote foreign spot" and was of a factional character. He invited the students to come to Paris "to study Social-Democracy", instead of the "*separatist* factional '*science*'" of the otzovists and god-builders (see present edition, Vol. 15, pp. 472-78).

For a detailed history of the school and its characteristic, see Lenin's articles "The Faction of Supporters of Otzovism and God-Building" and "A Shameful Fiasco" (present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 29-61, 85-86). p. 225

[280] A reference to the failure to attend the Fifth Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (All-Russia Conference of 1908) by the representative of the Duma Social-Democratic group. The rapporteur Vishnevsky (I. P. Goldenberg) said it was accidental. p. 227

[281] A group of intellectuals acting as advisers to the Social-Democratic group in the Third Duma, most of them liquidators and revisionists—A. N. Potresov, S. N. Prokopovich, etc. Making use of the fact that the leaders of the Bolshevik Party were in hiding and unable to work legally with the Duma group, these persons tried to direct the group's activity along anti-Party lines, and this gave rise to the question of doing without their services. p. 227

[282] A reference to the establishment of a promotion committee for the Social-Democratic group in the Third Duma. The Conference decided to set up a promotion committee, and Lenin, who was elected to the committee, was very active on it. In particular he wrote his "Explanatory Note on the Draft of the Main Grounds of the Bill on the Eight-Hour Working Day" (see present edition Vol. 16, pp. 110-16). p. 227

[283] A reference to the paper which was to be published by the R.S.D.L.P. group in the Duma. Subsequently, from 1910 to 1912 the legal Bolshevik newspaper *Zvezda* (The Star) was published with the participation of the Duma group. p. 228

[284] This addendum was incorporated in point three of the first section of the resolution (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh...*, Part I, p. 223). p. 228

[285] *Dal* (Horizon)—a literary and socio-political magazine published by the liquidators in St. Petersburg. Three issues were put out: the first in 1908, the second and third in 1909. p. 229

[286] Lenin's proposal was incorporated in the resolution "On Legal Publishing" (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh...*, Part I, p. 232). p. 229

[287] *The First World Socialist Congress of the Second International* was held in Paris in July 1889. Ideological guidance was provided by Frederick Engels. There was acute political struggle between the Marxists and the anarchists, who repudiated political struggle. The Congress decided on the need to strengthen the mass working-class movement and set up socialist parties for political struggle and the winning of power by the proletariat. The Congress said that the ultimate aim of the labour movement was socialism and, despite anarchist protests, resolved to struggle for an eight-hour working day, higher wages, abolition of payments in kind, etc. It also adopted the historic decision of celebrating May Day by staging demonstrations as a mark of proletarian solidarity. p. 231

[288] *The International Socialist Congress in Copenhagen* (Eighth Congress of the Second International) was held from August 28 to September 3, 1910. It was attended by 896 delegates representing countries in Europe, North and South America, South Africa and Australia. Russia like Austria, Britain, France and Germany, had 20 votes, of which the Social-Democrats (including the Lithuanian and Armenian Social-Democrats) had 10; the S.R.s—7; the trade unions—3. Among those who represented the R.S.D.L.P. were V. I. Lenin, G. V. Plekhanov, A. M. Kollontai and A. V. Lunacharsky.

Five committees were set up for preliminary discussion and drafting of resolutions on various questions: co-operatives, trade unions, international solidarity, and unity of the trade union movement in Austria, the struggle against war; labour legislation and unemployment; miscellaneous, including socialist unity, capital punishment, Finland, Argentina, Persia, etc.

Lenin was on the co-operative committee, one of the most important ones.

The resolution on the struggle against war—"Arbitration Courts and Disarmament"—confirmed the resolution of the Stuttgart Congress of 1907 on "Militarism and International Conflicts", which included; the amendments motioned by Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg, calling on the socialists of all countries to make use of the economic and political crisis caused by war to overthrow the bourgeoisie. The resolution of the Copenhagen Congress also bound the socialist parties and their representatives in parliaments to demand that their governments reduce armaments, and settle conflicts between states through arbitration courts, and urged the workers of all countries to stage protests against the threat of war.

Lenin held a conference of Left-wing Social-Democrats attending the Congress to rally the revolutionary Marxists in the international arena. p. 231

[289] Data on the limitation of working hours in various countries are given in the works of Karl Kautsky, *Marx's ökonomische Lehren* (*The Economic Doctrine of Marx*) and *Der Arbeiterschutzgezetzgebung und der Achtstundentag* (*Legislative Labour Protection and the 8-hour Working Day*). p. 232

[290] *Meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee members living abroad* was held in Paris from May 28 to June 4 (June 10 to 17), 1911. It was prepared and called under Lenin's direction apart from the Central Committee Bureau Abroad, whose liquidationist majority had repeatedly thwarted the convocation of a C.C. Plenary Meeting. Preparations for the meeting began in April 1911. It was to take measures to call a Plenary meeting of the Central Committee and eliminate the grave crisis in which the Party found itself, being virtually without central governing bodies. The meeting was attended by Bolsheviks, Polish and Latvian Social-Democrats one *Golos* man and one Bundist. The Latvian Social-Democrat M. V. Ozolin announced that in accordance with a decision of his Central Committee he would attend the meeting with voice only. The Bundist Lieber said that he had not been authorised by the Bund C.C. to represent it at the meeting.

In view of the forthcoming elections to the Fourth Duma, the meeting outlined measures to elaborate the Party's tactics in the election campaign and draft an electoral platform. The main item on the agenda was the calling of a Party conference. Because it was impossible to call a Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee right away, the meeting undertook to call a conference, and set up an Organising Commission to prepare the conference. The meeting adopted Lenin's proposal to set up a Russian collegium for practical work in preparing the conference (see p. 240). The meeting decisions provided for invitations to Party organisations abroad to work together on the Organising Commission. Lenin, who voted for the resolution as a whole, lodged a protest against the invitation to the Organising Commission of representatives of anti-Party groups—the *Golos* and *Vperyod* followers (pp. 240-41).

The meeting condemned the anti-Party, factional policy of the Central Committee Bureau Abroad, and decided to refer the question of its existence to the C.C. Plenary Meeting. In the voting on the last section of the resolution, Lenin abstained, because he insisted on an immediate reorganisation of the C.C.B.A. To handle technical matters (Party publishing, transportation, etc.). the meeting set up a Technical Commission which was to be responsible to the group of members and alternate members of the Central Committee attending the meeting.

A special bulletin issued after the meeting—"Announcement"—set out the circumstances in which the meeting had been called, its composition and purposes. It also contained the resolutions of the meeting.

This meeting was an important step in mustering the Party forces, in uniting them for the struggle against the *Golos* liquidators, the *Vperyod* followers and the Trotskyites, and for strengthening the Party. Its decisions helped to rally and strengthen local Party organisations. To prepare a general Party conference, Lenin sent to Russia experienced Party workers—the Bolsheviks G. K. Orjonikidze (Sergo), B. A. Breslav (Zakhar) and I. I. Shvarts (Semyon). By September 1911, the meeting decisions were approved by the committees and the Social-Democratic organisations

of a number of towns in Russia. In September 1911, there was formed the Russian Organising Commission, consisting of representatives of a number of Social-Democratic organisations. The Commission prepared the convocation in January 1912 of the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. For the material on the meeting see also present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 195-205. p. 233

[291] The document is printed from a copy in F. E. Dzerzhinsky's hand. The original written by Lenin has not been found.

The minutes of the June meeting of the C.C. members contain no indication that Lenin made the report at the meeting. It might have been given to the conferees before the meeting opened. p. 233

[292] *The Plenary Meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee*, known as the "unity" meeting, was held in Paris from January 2 to 23 (January 15 to February 5), 1910.

It was attended by representatives of all factions and groups and of non-Russian Social-Democratic organisations. The conciliators had a majority at the meeting. Lenin conducted a persistent struggle against the opportunists and conciliators to secure the condemnation of liquidationism and otzovism and to bring the Bolsheviks and the pro-Party Mensheviks closer together. On the agenda were these questions: 1) Report by the Russian Bureau of the C.C. 2) Report by the C.C. Bureau Abroad. 3) Report by the Editorial Board of the Central Organ. 4) Reports by the Central Committees of the non-Russian Social-Democratic Parties. 5) State of affairs in the Party. 6) Convocation of a regular Party conference. 7) Rules of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee, etc.

On Lenin's insistence, the Plenary Meeting adopted the resolution "On the State of Affairs in the Party", which condemned liquidationism and otzovism, recognised the danger of these trends and urged the need to fight them. Lenin said that the January Plenary Meeting finally determined the Party's tactical line during the counter-revolutionary period, deciding, in pursuance of the resolutions of the Fifth (All-Russia) Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (1908), that liquidationism and otzovism were manifestations of bourgeois influence on the proletariat. The Plenary Meeting also connected the question of the need to have real Party unity, with the Party's ideological and political tasks in the current historical period. At the same time, Lenin sharply condemned the Plenary Meeting's conciliatory decisions.

For details about the Plenary Meeting see Lenin's "Notes of a Publicist," (present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 195-259). p. 233

[293] A reference to the members and alternate members of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee elected at the Fifth (London) Congress, which was held from April 30 to May 19 (May 13 to June 1), 1907. p. 234

[294] The Rules of the Central Committee, adopted at the January 1910 Plenary Meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee, said: "Plenary Meetings (of 15 members) shall be attended by

1) members of the collegium operating in Russia; 2) members of the C.C. Bureau Abroad, with the exception of those who are not members of the C.C.; 3) if these do not add up to the figure of 15, the other candidates shall attend the Plenary Meeting in the following order: a) candidates of the London Congress doing any Party work in Russia; b) members of the C.C. and alternate members living abroad and engaged in work assigned to them by the Central Committee" (*K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh*..., Part I, p. 239). p. 234

[295] *The Vperyod group*—an anti-Party group of otzovists, ultimatumists and god-builders, organised on the initiative of A. Bogdanov and G. A. Alexinsky in December 1909, following the break-up of the otzovist-ultimatumist factional centre, the Capri school; it had a periodical of the same name.

The group, without any support in the working-class movement, broke up in 1913 and 1914, but was formally dissolved after the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917. p. 235

[296] *Diskussionny Listok* (Discussion Bulletin)—a supplement to *Sotsial-Demokrat*, the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P.; it was published in Paris under a decision of the January Plenary Meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee from March 6 (19), 1910, to April 29 (May 12), 1911. There were three issues. On its Editorial Board were representatives of the Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, ultimatumists, Bundists, Plekhanovites, Polish Social-Democrats and Latvian Social-Democrats. It carried Lenin's articles "Notes of a Publicist", "The Historical Meaning of the Inner-Party Struggle in Russia" and "A Conversation Between a Legalist and an Opponent of Liquidationism" (see present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 195-259, 374-92, and Vol. 17, pp. 179-88). p. 235

[297] A reference to the School Commission (Committee) set up by the January 1910 Plenary Meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee, to organise a Party school abroad. It consisted of nine persons: two Bolsheviks, two Mensheviks, two *Vperyod* supporters, and one each from the national organisations—the Bund, the Latvian and the Polish Social-Democrats. p. 235

[298] *The Fourth Duma* opened on November 15 (28), 1912. Elections were held in the autumn of 1912 under the reactionary electoral law of June 3 (16), 1907, and were accompanied by a series of government measures designed to create a Black-Hundred majority in the Duma. Lenin described the election campaign and assessed the class and party composition of the Duma in his article "Results of the Elections" (see present edition, Vol. 18, pp. 493-518).

The Social-Democratic group in the Fourth Duma included six Bolsheviks—A. Y. Badayev, M. K. Muranov, G. I. Petrovsky, F. N. Samoilov, N. R. Shagov and R. V. Malinovsky (who later was exposed as a provocateur), seven Mensheviks and one member who did not enjoy full rights (the Warsaw deputy, E. J. Jagiello), and who sided with the Mensheviks. Making use of their slight numerical superiority, the Mensheviks hampered the work of the group

and blocked the passage of a number of measures proposed by the Bolsheviks. In October 1913, the Bolshevik deputies, on instructions from the Central Committee, withdrew from the united Social-Democratic group and formed their own. Lenin gave day-to-day guidance to the Bolshevik deputies and taught them to make revolutionary use of the Duma rostrum.

The Duma proved to be incapable of settling any major questions which the country's objective development brought up, and its work increasingly boiled down to wordy debate. Its legislative activity was largely designed to strengthen such pillars of the autocracy as the courts, the church and the police.

The Duma approved Russia's entry into the First World War. The Mensheviks and the S.R.s took a defencist stand. Only the Bolshevik Party resolutely opposed the war. The Bolshevik group refused to vote the war credits and started revolutionary propaganda in the masses. In November 1914, the Bolshevik deputies were arrested and committed for trial.

In August 1915, the bourgeois and landowner groups set up a "Progressive bloc", consisting of more than one-half of the deputies. Lenin said it was "the liberal-Octobrist bloc for the purpose of reaching an understanding with the tsar on a programme of reforms and mobilising industry for the victory over Germany" (see present edition, Vol. 21, p. 378).

On February 26 (March 11) 1917, the tsar announced the dissolution of the Fourth Duma, but, while not daring to protest openly the deputies decided to continue their sittings unofficially. On February 27 (March 12) they formed a Provisional Committee of the Duma to fight the revolution and save the monarchy. By agreement with the S.R. and Menshevik representatives of the Petrograd Soviet, the Committee decided to set up a bourgeois Provisional Government. The Committee's members were rabid enemies of the revolution, and at their private meetings demanded the establishment of a military dictatorship and the abolition of the Soviets. On October 6 (19), 1917, under the pressure of the revolutionary masses, the bourgeois Provisional Government was forced to decree the dissolution of the Duma. p. 235

[299] *Nasha Zarya* (Our Dawn)—a legal monthly of the Menshevik liquidators published in St. Petersburg from January 1910 to September 1914. It was edited by A. N. Potresov, and among its contributors were F. I. Dan and S. O. Tsederbaum (V. Yezhov). It was the liquidationist centre in Russia. A resolution of the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (1912) said that "a section of the Social-Democrats, grouped round the journals *Nasha Zarya* and *Dyelo Zhizni*, have openly come out in defence of a trend which the whole Party has recognised as a product of bourgeois influence on the proletariat" (*K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh*..., Part I, p. 283). p. 235

[300] *Dyelo Zhizni* (Life Cause)—a legal journal, an organ of the Menshevik liquidators, published in St. Petersburg from January to October 1911. There were nine issues. p. 235

[301] *Zvezda* (The Star)—a legal Bolshevik newspaper published in St. Petersburg from December 16 (29), 1910, to April 22 (May 5), 1912. It was initially published as a weekly, twice a week from January 21 (February 3), 1912, and three times a week from March 8 (21), 1912.

Lenin gave ideological guidance to the newspaper: he carried on a correspondence with the members of the Editorial Board, directing their work, criticising their mistakes, especially in the initial period of its publication, struggling for the paper's consistent Marxist approach. A great deal of editorial and organisational work was done by N. N. Baturin, N. G. Poletayev, K. S. Yeremeyev and M. S. Olminsky. Among those who took an active part in the paper were V. D. Bonch-Bruyevich and Demyan Bedny. It carried a number of articles by G. V. Plekhanov. Lenin got Maxim Gorky to write for it. *Zvezda* enjoyed great prestige among the working people of Russia. p. 236

[302] The attendant circumstances were as follows: the *Golos* Menshevik B. I. Gorev (Goldman) came out against the presence at the meeting of the representatives of non-Russian organisations, M. I. Lieber of the Bund and M. V. Ozolin of the Latvian Social-Democrats, without mandates from their Central Committees. Lieber said they had had no time to contact their centres and that he was not representing the Bund. p. 237

[303] A reference to the speeches by Gorev (Goldman) and Lieber, who said that there were members of the Russia Bureau in Russia who should be contacted before the C.C. Plenary Meeting is called abroad. p. 237

[304] *The Central Committee Bureau in Russia* was elected at a general meeting of the Collegium of C.C. members, which was active in Russia from 1908. The Bureau was in charge of all the affairs of the Russian Collegium in between general meetings of the C.C. In 1910 and 1911, after the January 1910 Plenary Meeting of the C.C., the Bureau in Russia consisted of the following members and alternate members of the Central Committee: the Bolsheviks I. P. Goldenberg (Meshkovsky) and I. F. Dubrovinsky (Innokenty), and after their arrest, V. P. Nogin (Makar) and G. D. Leiteisen (Lindov). The Menshevik liquidators, members and alternate members of the C.C., kept aloof from its work, while I. A. Isuv (Mikhail), P. A. Bronstein (Yuri) and K. M. Yermolayev (Roman) not only refused to participate but declared that they considered the very existence of the C.C. to be harmful. All the efforts of the Bureau to call the Russian Collegium failed.

In March 1911, following the arrest of Nogin and Leiteisen, the Central Committee Bureau in Russia ceased to exist. Lenin gave a positive evaluation of the Russia Bureau's efforts to organise work in Russia and call the C.C.'s Russian Collegium, but sharply criticised the members' conciliatory stand.

At the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P., the Bureau in Russia was re-established. It consisted of C.C. mem-

bers: G. K. Orjonikidze, S. S. Spandaryan, J. V. Stalin and Y. M. Sverdlov, and alternate C.C. members: M. I. Kalinin, Y. D. Stasova and others. In view of frequent arrests of Party workers in Russia, the composition of the Bureau was subsequently changed many times, new members being co-opted in place of the old ones. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917, the Bureau in Russia ceased to operate. p. 238

[305] A statement by the Bundist Ionov (F. M. Koigen) said that not having any powers from the Bund's C.C., he was unable to attend the meeting and that he would send on his invitation to the Bund's C.C. at the earliest opportunity. p. 238

[306] A reference to the speech by Lieber (Ber) to the effect that there was no need to decide on the question of a C.C. Plenary Meeting by having an urgent meeting of C.C. members, but that a "legal way out" should be sought through the C.C.B.A. p. 238

[307] The speech was in reply to Lieber's statement that the majority of the C.C.B.A. wanted a Plenary Meeting called and were prepared to adopt an official resolution on this question. p. 239

[308] A reference to the proposal by the liquidationist majority of the C.C.B.A. to call a C.C. Plenary Meeting in Russia. p. 239

[309] This speech, like the next one, is connected with the discussion of the persons entitled to attend a C.C. Plenary Meeting. p. 239

[310] *The Organising Commission* (*Organising Commission Abroad*, *O.C.A.*) for convening a general Party conference was set up by the C.C. members' meeting on June 1 (14), 1911, and consisted of Bolsheviks, conciliators and Polish Social-Democrats. Other organisations and groups abroad invited to take part in the commission did not send their representatives. The O.C. sent G. K. Orjonikidze as its agent to Russia to work for the preparation of a general Party conference, and issued an appeal "To All Social-Democratic Party Organisations, Groups and Circles", urging them to start elections to the Russian Organising Commission.

As a result of the work carried out by the Bolsheviks, the R.O.C. was setup. At the end of October, the O.C.A. discussed the R.O.C.'s "Announcement" of its constitution and resolutions stating that it assumed full powers in calling the conference and that the Organising and Technical Commissions Abroad were to be subordinate to the R.O.C. When the conciliatory majority of the O.C.A. refused to abide by these decisions, the Bolsheviks left the O.C.A. On October 30 (November 12), Orjonikidze, who had arrived in Paris, gave a report in the O.C.A. on the activity of the R.O.C. after which the O.C.A. was forced to recognise the governing role of the R.O.C. But soon the O.C.A. started an open struggle against the R.O.C. On November 20 (December 3) it issued a leaflet, "Open Letter to the Russian Organising Commission", accusing the latter of factional activity. The O.C.A.'s anti-Party activity was exposed by Orjonikidze in his "Letter to the Editorial Board" carried in No. 25 of *Sotsial-Demokrat* on December 8 (21), 1911.

All the work of calling the general Party conference, held in January 1912, was carried out by the R.O.C. which rallied together the illegal Party organisations in Russia. p. 240

[311] The statement also bears the signature of G. Y. Zinoviev. p. 240

[312] A reference to the resolution of the June meeting of the C.C. members "On Convening a Party Conference". p. 240

[313] The statement also bears the signature of G. Y. Zinoviev. p. 241

[314] *The Technical Commission* (*Technical Commission Abroad*, *T.C.A.*) was set up by the June meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. C.C. members at their sitting of June 1 (14), 1911, to perform the technical work in connection with Party publishing, transportation, etc. As a temporary organ, pending a C.C. Plenary Meeting, the T.C.A. was subordinate to the group of C.C. members who took part in the June meeting. It consisted of one representative each from the Bolsheviks, the conciliators and the Polish Social-Democrats. The conciliatory majority of the T.C.A.—M. K. Vladimirov and Y. L. Leder, who supported him—held up the issue of money for the O.C.A., which was to go into a fund for the convocation of the Party conference, as well as appropriations for publishing the Bolshevik newspaper *Zvezda*, it also tried to hold up the publication of the Party's Central Organ, the newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat*. In its press organ—*Informatsionny Bulleten* (Information Bulletin)—the T.C.A. attacked Lenin and the Bolsheviks. During the discussion of the "Announcement" and the resolution of the R.O.C. at the T.C.A.'s sitting of October 19 (November 1), the Bolshevik M. F. Vladimirsky motioned that the T.C.A. abide by the decisions of the R.O.C. The motion was rejected. Vladimirsky withdrew, and the Bolsheviks severed all ties with the T.C.A. p. 241

[315] A reference to the *Party school at Longjumeau*, a few kilometres from Paris, set up by the Bolsheviks under Lenin's guidance in the spring of 1911 for the workers of Party organisations of the major proletarian centres in Russia. There were 13 students representing Moscow, St. Petersburg, Baku, Ivanovo-Voznesensk, Nikolayev, Tiflis, Sormovo, Yekaterinoslav Gubernia, Dabrowa District (Poland) and 5 external students. Among them were I. S. Belostotsky, B. A. Breslav, I. D. Chugurin, A. I. Dogadov, A. I. Ivanova, G. K. Orjonikidze, I. V. Prisyagin, E. Prukhnyak, I. I. Shvarts and Y. D. Zevin. Most of them were Bolsheviks, but there were some pro-Party Mensheviks and one *Vperyod* man. The lecturers were chosen by the School Committee together with the students. Invitations to lecture were sent out to representatives of various trends in the R.S.D.L.P. The Mensheviks L. Martov, F. I. Dan and others declined, and most of the lecturers were Bolsheviks.

Lenin was the school's ideological guide and its principal lecturer. When two-thirds of the students had arrived, Lenin held classes on the *Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Lenin read 29 lectures (43 hours) on political econ-

omy and 12 lectures (18 hours) on the agrarian question. Under the initial plan, the lectures on philosophy were to be given by G. V. Plekhanov. When it turned out that he was not coming after all, the students asked Lenin to give the lectures, and he read three on the materialist view of history. Also at the students' request, Lenin spoke on the present situation and the state of affairs in the Party.

After completing the course on August 17 (30), the students went back for illegal work in Russia. They took an active part in preparing and holding the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. Many of those who graduated from the school subsequently became leading Party and Soviet Government workers. p. 241

[316] This plan was the basis of a lecture, "Manifesto of the Liberal Labour Party", which Lenin read in Paris on November 14 (27), 1911.

A reference to an article by N. A. Rozhkov, "The Present State of Russia and the Main Task of the Labour Movement at the Present Moment", published in the journal *Nasha Zarya* No. 9-10 in 1911. p. 242

[317] The proposal was motioned by Lenin at a meeting of Bolshevik groups abroad held in Paris on December 16 (29), 1911, when it was examining the question of whether there should be a detailed discussion of the draft Rules of the Organisation Abroad at the meeting itself, or whether they should be referred to the Committee of the Organisation Abroad for co-ordination with the groups and final approval. Lenin's proposal was adopted by eight votes to one.

The meeting was held in Paris from December 14 to 17 (27 to 30), 1911, under Lenin's direction. It was called on the initiative of the Paris circle for the promotion of the Bolshevik *Rabochaya Gazeta*, and was aimed at uniting the Bolshevik forces abroad and promoting the convocation of an all-Russia Party conference. It was attended by 11 delegates with vote from the Bolshevik groups of Paris, Nancy, Zurich, Davos, Geneva, Liége, Berne, Bremen and Berlin. The Bolsheviks of Toulouse, Lausanne, London, Brussels, Antwerp, Copenhagen, Nice and other cities were unable to send their representatives for technical and financial reasons. Some Bolshevik groups managed to send in detailed reports. On the agenda were these items: 1) reports of the Organising Bureau and delegates from the localities; 2) the state of affairs in the Party; 3) the state of affairs abroad and attitude to the various trends; 4) organisational matters; 5) the tasks of work abroad; 6) attitude to the conference; 7) other matters.

The meeting declared the final break-away of the *Golos* and *Vperyod* supporters from the Party, their complete bankruptcy, and approved the measures of the June meeting of the C.C. members on convening a Party conference. The meeting adopted the resolution motioned by Lenin on support for the Russian Organising Commission and the conference it was trying to call, and resolved to set up the R.S.D.L.P. Organisation Abroad (with local sections) on the basis of conducting a true Party line, without allowing any

agreements with the liquidators; it also elected the Committee of the Organisation Abroad.

The meeting united the Bolshevik groups abroad into a single organisation, approved the formation of the R.O.C. and declared that "it is the duty of every Party member to support it to the utmost". p. 243

[318] *The Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. Organisation Abroad* (*C.O.A.*) was elected at a meeting of the Bolshevik groups abroad held in Paris in December 1911. It included N. A. Semashko, M. F. Vladimirsky, Inessa Armand and others. The work of the C.O.A. was directed by Lenin. It played an important part in rallying the Party forces and in the struggle against the Menshevik liquidators, the conciliators, the Trotskyites and other opportunists. The C.O.A. responded to all the major events in Russia and measures in directing Party work and the Russian revolutionary movement, and also helped the C.C. to publish Party literature abroad. It ceased functioning in 1917. p. 243

[319] The exact date and the circumstances in which Lenin gave this report on the political situation have not been established. p. 243

[320] *Lidvaliad*—the case of the big swindler and speculator E. Lidval and V. I. Gurko, Deputy Minister for the Interior. With Gurko's help, Lidval concluded a deal with the government to supply 10 million poods of rye to the famine-stricken gubernias of Russia from October to December 1906. Having received a sizable advance through Gurko from the treasury, Lidval brought up less than 10 per cent of the total quantity of grain to the railway lines by mid-December 1906. This embezzlement and speculation on the famine were exposed and widely reported, forcing the tsarist government to institute legal proceedings. But apart from being removed from his post, Gurko was not punished in any way. p. 243

[321] A reference to the resolution of the Fifth Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (All-Russia Conference of 1908), "The Present Moment and the Tasks of the Party" (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh*..., Part I, pp. 195-97). p. 244

[322] A reference to the explanations by Minister of Public Education L. A. Kasso in the Fourth Duma in connection with the question entered by 44 deputies on December 14 (27), 1912, over the arrest of 34 pupils of secondary schools in St. Petersburg at a meeting in Vitmer's private school. The pupils were suspected by the secret police of belonging to an illegal circle. The question was discussed at the 12th 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th sittings of the Duma. On February 6 (19), 1913, a majority adopted a formula to proceed with the business of the Duma, recognising the Minister's explanations as being unsatisfactory. p. 244

[323] *The Sixth* (*Prague*) *All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.* was held from January 5 to 17 (18 to 30), 1912. It had the actual importance of a congress and was directed by Lenin. He gave reports

on the present situation and the Party's tasks, on the work of the International Socialist Bureau, and also spoke on other questions. Lenin drafted resolutions on all the important items of the agenda.

Of tremendous theoretical and practical importance were the Conference resolutions on "Liquidationism and the Group of Liquidators" and "The Party Organisation Abroad". The Conference declared that by their behaviour the liquidators had finally placed themselves outside the Party, and expelled them from the R.S.D.L.P. The Conference condemned the activity of anti-Party groups abroad: the Mensheviks supporting *Golos*, the *Vperyod* group and the Trotskyites. It recognised as absolutely necessary the existence of a single Party organisation abroad working under the supervision and direction of the Central Committee to promote the Party, and said that the groups abroad which "refuse to submit to the Russian centre of Social-Democratic work, i.e., the Central Committee, and introduce disorganisation because of their separate contacts with Russia in obviation of the Central Committee, have no right to use the name of the R.S.D.L.P." The Conference adopted a resolution on "The Character and Organisational Forms of Party Work", approved Lenin's draft organisational Rules of the Party, endorsed the newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat* as the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P., elected the Central Committee and set up the C.C. Bureau in Russia.

The Prague Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. played an outstanding part in building up the Bolshevik Party, a new type of party, and in strengthening its unity. It summed up the results of a whole historical period of the Bolshevik struggle against the Mensheviks, and by expelling the Menshevik liquidators from the Party, consolidated the Bolshevik victory; the Conference laid down the Party's political line and tactics in the conditions of the fresh revolutionary upsurge.

The Prague Conference was of great international importance. It showed the revolutionary elements of the parties in the Second International an example of resolute struggle against opportunism, taking the struggle to a complete break with the opportunists. For details about the Prague Conference see present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 451-86. p. 245

[324] Lenin made the remark in connection with the proposal of a vote of thanks to the R.O.C. for the work it had done in rallying all the Party organisations in Russia and calling the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P., and to let its representative attend the Conference with vote (see present edition, Vol. 17, p. 462). p. 245

[325] *The Russian Organising Commission* (*R.O.C.*) was set up by the June 1911 meeting of the C.C. members to convene an all-Russia Party conference. It was constituted at a meeting of representatives of local Party organisations at the end of September and functioned until the opening of the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. p. 246

[326] A reference to the sitting of the International Socialist Bureau in Zurich on September 23 and 24, 1911. p. 247

[327] During the work of the International Socialist Congress in Copenhagen, members of the Russian delegation, V. I. Lenin, G. V. Plekhanov and Adolf Warski (A. S. Warszawski), representing the Polish Social-Democrats, sent a protest to the Executive of the German Social-Democratic Party over the publication in *Vorwärts*, its Central Organ, of L. Trotsky's article containing slanderous attacks on the R.S.D.L.P. (for the protest, see Lenin, Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*, Vol. 47, pp. 296-98).

Lenin also came out against Trotsky's slanderous campaign, in the newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat* No. 17 of September 25 (October 8), 1910, in an article entitled "How Certain Social-Democrats Inform the International About the State of Affairs in the R.S.D.L.P.", and in *Diskussionny Listok* No. 3 of April 29 (May 12), 1911, in his article "The Historical Meaning of the Inner-Party Struggle in Russia" (see present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 284-86, 374-92). p. 247

[328] A reference to the walk-out from the Magdeburg Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party, held from September 18 to 24, 1910, of the Social-Democratic deputies of the Baden Landtag. The Social-Democratic group of the Baden Landtag voted for the government budget despite the decisions of earlier party congresses which prohibited Social-Democratic deputies from voting for the bourgeois government's budget. By an overwhelming majority of 289 votes to 80, the Magdeburg Congress condemned the opportunist tactics of the Baden Social-Democrats. The latter then announced that they would reserve the right not to submit to Congress decisions. In response, the majority of the Congress adopted a special resolution immediately expelling from the Party anyone violating the Congress decision on budget voting. Before the resolution was adopted, the Baden deputies staged a walk-out.

For details about the Magdeburg Congress see Lenin's article "Two Worlds" (present edition, Vol. 16, pp. 305-13). p. 247

[329] A reference to the differences between the Czech and Austrian Social-Democrats over trade union unity. At the Extraordinary Congress of Austrian Trade Unions in December 1905, the Czech Social-Democrats demanded the establishment of national trade unions with jurisdiction extending over the whole of Austria. The proposal was rejected by a vast majority, but the Czechs refused to submit to the Congress decision. In 1910, the Austrian Social-Democrats took the matter to the International Socialist Congress at Copenhagen, which rejected the separatist Czech proposal and came out unanimously for trade union unity. p. 247

[330] A reference to the letter sent by the opportunist Molkenbuhr to the Executive of the German Social-Democratic Party proposing that no criticism should be made of the German Government's colonial policy in view of the impending elections to the Reichstag. Rosa Luxemburg published the letter. p. 248

[331] A reference to the resolution on the organisational question adopted by the Fifth Conference of the R.S.D.L.P., which was held in Paris from December 21 to 27, 1908 (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh...*, Part I, pp. 201-03). p. 250

[332] A reference to the illegal Social-Democratic Party of Germany during the period of the Anti-Socialist Law introduced by the Bismarck government in 1878 to fight the working-class and socialist movement. The law banned all organisations of the Social-Democratic Party, mass workers' organisations and the labour press; socialist literature was confiscated, the Social-Democrats were harassed and exiled. But the Social-Democratic Party prevailed in the face of these persecutions, and reorganised its activity to meet the illegal conditions; its Central Organ, the newspaper *Sozial-Demokrat*, was published abroad and party congresses met regularly (1880, 1883 and 1887) outside the country; in the underground in Germany, the Social-Democratic organisations and groups were being rapidly revived under the leadership of an illegal C.C. At the same time, the party made wide use of legal opportunities to strengthen its ties with the masses, and its influence continued to grow: the number of votes it won at the Reichstag elections in 1890 was more than three times greater than in 1878. The German Social-Democrats received great assistance from Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. In 1890, the Anti-Socialist Law was abolished under pressure from the massive and ever growing working-class movement. p. 252.

[333] The plan was printed in the text of an announcement issued by the Paris section of the R.S.D.L.P. Organisation Abroad. It said:

Comrade L e n i n
w i l l g i v e a l e c t u r e o n t h e
"**Revolutionary Upsurge of the Russian Proletariat**"
at Alcazar Hall
190 Avenue de Choisy
on Thursday, June 13, 1912.

The questions listed in the plan are dealt with in a number of Lenin's works written in 1912, especially in his article "Revolutionary Upswing" (see present edition, Vol. 18, pp. 102-09).

The text of the announcement was reproduced in the journal *Istorichesky Arkhiv* (Historical Archives) No. 2 in 1955. p. 254

[334] A reference to the fusillade of unarmed workers at the Lena gold mines in Siberia on April 4 (17), 1912. News of the tragedy aroused the working class of Russia, and the country was swept by demonstrations, meetings and protest strikes. The Social-Democratic group in the Duma tabled a question to the tsarist government over the Lena fusillade. The tsarist Minister Maklakov have this brazen reply: "That's how it was, and that's how it will be in the future!" This intensified the indignation of the workers. Up to 300,000 workers took part in the protest strikes against the Lena fusillade, and they merged with the May Day strikes involving

up to 400,000 workers. Lenin wrote: "The Lena shootings led to the revolutionary temper of the masses developing into a revolutionary upswing of the masses" (see present edition, Vol. 18, p. 103). p. 254

[335] The article, written in September 1912, dealt with the state of affairs in the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania, which was split. One section consisted of those who supported the Party's Chief Executive headed by Rosa Luxemburg and J. Tyszka—the so-called "Zarzadists". On the whole, the Chief Executive took an internationalist stand and waged a struggle in Poland against nationalism and reformism, but followed an erroneous line on the struggle within the R.S.D.L.P., taking a conciliatory attitude to the Menshevik liquidators; it tended to detach itself from the general Party life and weakened contacts with the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee, despite the fact that the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania was an autonomous organisation within the R.S.D.L.P. In the struggle against the mistakes of the Chief Executive, there took shape an opposition represented by the so-called "Rozlamists", who relied on the Party's Warsaw organisation headed by former members of the Chief Executive J. Hanecki, A. Malecki and others. Rozlamists were in close contact with the Bolsheviks and supported their action. Lenin said that in that period the Warsaw organisation was the strongest and most consistently revolutionary of all the organisations of the Polish Social-Democrats (see Lenin's article "The Split Among the Polish Social-Democrats", Vol. 18, pp. 479-83).

The article was aimed against the erroneous line of the Chief Executive, which objectively inflicted grave harm on the unity of the working-class movement in Russia as a whole and played into the hands of the anti-Bolshevik trends in the R.S.D.L.P. While criticising the grave errors of Rosa Luxemburg and J. Tyszka, Lenin put a great value on their activity and tried to help them to take a correct stand. Lenin was known to regard Rosa Luxemburg as an outstanding leader of the Polish, German and the entire international working-class movement. He wrote later that for all her mistakes, Rosa Luxemburg was "an eagle" and that "Communists all over the world cherish her memory" (see present edition, Vol. 33, p. 210).

The article was written for the *Bremer Bürger-Zeitung* which was under the influence of the Left-wing Social-Democrats; it was translated into German by Malecki (see Lenin, Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*, Vol. 48, Document 72). The article was not published. p. 255

[336] A reference to the charge against Karl Radek that he had committed a number of unethical acts. This was levelled by a Party court set up by the Chief Executive of the Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania. By a decision of the court Radek was expelled from the ranks of the Social-Democracy of Poland and Lithuania.

A commission to review the court's decision was set up in Paris in early September 1913 on the initiative of the Bureau of the sections of the Social-Democracy of Poland and Lithuania abroad (Rozlamists). Lenin supported the review of the Radek case, for he believed that the charge against Radek was the outcome of the sharp struggle which the Chief Executive was waging against the Rozlamists. The commission worked for five months and arrived at the conclusion that there had been no ground for committing Radek to trial by a Party court and expelling him from the Party. It proposed that Radek should be considered a member of the Social-Democracy of Poland and Lithuania and of the R.S.D.L.P. p. 255

[337] A reference to Martov's libellous pamphlet *Saviours or Abolitionists?* (*Who Destroyed the R.S.D.L.P. and How*) published by *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata*, Paris, 1911. p. 255

[338] A reference to the resolution "The State of Affairs in the Party" adopted by the R.S.D.L.P. C.C. Plenary Meeting in January 1910 (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh...*, Part I, pp. 234-33). p. 255

[339] A reference to the members of the Central Committee Bureau Abroad J. Tyszka, from the Polish Social-Democrats, M. Lieber, from the Bund, and Shvarts (Y. Elias), from the Latvian Social-Democrats. p. 258

[340] A reference to the resolution "Liquidationism and the Group of Liquidators" adopted by the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. (see present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 480-81). p. 258

[341] A reference to the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. held from January 5 to 17 (18 to 30), 1912. See Note 323. p. 259

[342] This is a reply to the article published in the German Social-Democratic newspaper *Leipziger Volkszeitung* on September 28, 1912, on the liquidators' conference held in Vienna in August 1912, which formalised the anti-Party (so-called August) bloc. The article tended to mislead the German Social-Democrats, distorted the true character of the conference and championed the liquidators.

The article written by Lenin and signed by the R.S.D.L.P. C.C. was printed in *Leipziger Volkszeitung* No. 235 of October 9, 1912, and was soon sent by Lenin to the Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau Camille Huysmans. The article, Lenin wrote, "will give you an idea of this ostensibly Social-Democratic conference" (see Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*, Vol. 48, Document 76).

Leipziger Volkszeitung—a Social-Democratic daily published from 1894 to 1933; for a number of years it was edited by Franz Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg, and was an organ of the Left-wing Social-Democrats. From 1917 to 1922, it was the organ of the

German "Independents"; after 1922, the organ of the Right-wing Social-Democrats. p. 260

[343] Promotion groups of Social-Democratic functionaries of the open working-class movement were set up by the Menshevik liquidators from the end of 1910 to counteract the illegal Party organisations. These were small groups of intellectuals which had no ties with the working class. p. 260

[344] A reference to the legal organs of the Menshevik liquidators: the journal *Nasha Zarya* published in St. Petersburg from 1910 to 1916, and the newspaper *Nevsky Golos* published from May to August 1912. p. 260

[345] *Luch* (Ray)—a legal daily of the Menshevik liquidators published in St. Petersburg from September 16 (29), 1912, to July 5 (18), 1913. Altogether 237 issues were put out. The newspaper was mainly run on the contributions of liberals. Its ideological leaders were P. B. Axelrod, F. I. Dan, L. Martov and A. S. Martynov. On the pages of the paper, the liquidators attacked the revolutionary tactics of the Bolsheviks, preached the opportunist slogan of setting up a so-called "open party", opposed revolutionary mass strikes by workers and tried to revise the key propositions of the Party Programme. Lenin wrote that *Luch* was enslaved by liberal policy and said it was an organ of the renegades. p. 261

[346] The manifesto was written by Lenin in early October 1912 and was published by the R.S.D.L.P. C.C. as a separate leaflet. On October 10 (23), Lenin sent the manifesto to the Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau, Camille Huysmans, asking him to convey the text of the document to the secretaries of the Social-Democratic parties and the press. It was soon published in German in *Leipziger Volkszeitung* and *Vorwärts*, in French in the Belgian newspaper *Le Peuple*, and in French, German and English in the *Bulletin* of the International Socialist Bureau. It was also published by the Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. Organisation Abroad and as a special supplement to No. 28-29 of *Sotsial-Demokrat* of November 5 (18), 1912. p. 262

[347] *The First Balkan War* (*October 1912-May 1913*) was fought between Turkey and the countries of the Balkan alliance—Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro and Greece. It ended in the defeat of Turkey, which under the London Peace Treaty lost almost all her Balkan possessions. The Slav regions, Macedonia and Thrace, were liberated; the Albanian people won national independence. The First Balkan War, despite the fact that the monarchy and the bourgeoisie of the Balkan countries pursued their own dynastic and plunderous aims, was on the whole progressive—it marked the liberation of the Balkan people from the Turkish yoke and dealt a blow at the survivals of the serf system. Lenin said it was "one link in the chain of world events marking the collapse of the medieval state of affairs in Asia and Eastern Europe" (see present edition, Vol. 19, p. 39). p. 262

[348] *Golos Moskvy* (Voice of Moscow)—a daily, organ of the Octobrists, published in Moscow from 1906 to 1915. p. 264

[349] *Russkoye Slovo* (Russian Word)—a daily published in Moscow from 1895 (the first, pilot issue appeared in 1894); its publisher was I. D. Sytin. Nominally independent, the paper upheld the interests of the Russian bourgeoisie from a moderate liberal stand. It had good news coverage and was Russia's first paper to send its own correspondents to all the major cities of Russia and many world capitals.

In November 1917, the paper was closed down for running slanderous anti-Soviet reports. From January 1918 it was published under the name of *Novoye Slovo* (New Word) and *Nashe Slovo* (Our Word), and was finally closed down in July 1918. p. 265

[350] *Pravda* (The Truth)—a legal Bolshevik daily; the first issue was published in St. Petersburg on April 22 (May 5), 1912. The decision to start a mass working-class daily was adopted by the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.

It appeared at the time of the fresh revolutionary upsurge, when the country was swept by a wave of mass political strikes over the Lena fusillade. The paper was run on funds collected by the workers. It had a circulation of up to 40,000 copies, with some issues having a printing of 60,000. Lenin said the starting of the workers' daily was a great historic undertaking carried out by the St. Petersburg workers. Lenin provided the ideological direction, almost daily wrote for it, and gave instructions to its editors. Among its editors and contributors at various periods were N. N. Baturin, Demyan Bedny, M. I. Kalinin, N. K. Krupskaya, S. V. Malyshev, L. R. and V. R. Menzhinsky, V. M. Molotov, V. I. Nevsky, M. S. Olminsky, N. I. Podvoisky, N. G. Poletayev, M. A. Savelyev, K. N. Samoilova, Y. M. Sverdlov, N. A. Skrypnik, J. V. Stalin, P. I. Stučka, A. I. Ulyanova-Yelizarova, and K. S. Yeremeyev. The Bolshevik deputies to the Fourth Duma took an active part in the paper. Some of Maxim Gorky's writings were published in *Pravda*.

The paper was constantly harassed by the police; it was closed down by the tsarist government eight times, but continued to appear under other names: *Rabochaya Pravda*, *Severnaya Pravda*, *Pravda Truda*, *Za Pravdu*, *Proletarskaya Pravda*, *Put Pravdy*, *Rabochy* and *Trudovaya Pravda*. In these difficult conditions, the Bolsheviks managed to put out 636 issues in the course of over two years. On July 8 (21), 1914, the paper was closed down.

It was resumed only after the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917. From March 5 (18), 1917, *Pravda* was published as the organ of the Central Committee and the St. Petersburg Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. Two days after Lenin's return from abroad, on April 5 (18), 1917, he became a member of the Editorial Board and took over the direction of the paper. Between July and October 1917, *Pravda* was harassed by the counter-revolutionary bourgeois Provisional Government and had repeatedly to change its name. It was published as *Listok Pravdy*, *Proletary*, *Rabochy* and

Rabochy Put. After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, in October 27 (November 9), 1917, the Party's Central Organ resumed publication under its old name. p. 266

[351] In 1608 Russia was invaded by interventionist troops under Dmitry II the Impostor. The invaders drew near Moscow and camped in the village of Tushino where the Impostor formed a government with its own Court. Some of the Russian boyars deserted alternately to the Moscow and Tushino governments in an effort to safeguard themselves in the event of the victory of either side. It was those deserters that were nicknamed "Tushino turncoat". p. 267

[352] The report was published in *Le Peuple* No. 325 of November 20, 1912, and was introduced with this editorial note: "Citizen Lenin, a delegate of the I.S.B., has sent to the Secretariat [of the I.S.B.—*Ed*.] the following report about the results of the latest Russian elections already to hand."

In 1963, Lenin's report was reprinted in the book *Correspondance entre Lénine et Camille Huysmans*, *1905-1914*. Paris. p. 267

[353] The name given by Louis XVIII to the counter-revolutionary, extremely reactionary French Chamber of Deputies elected after the Bourbon restoration in August 1815. p. 268

[354] *Progressists*—a political grouping of the Russian liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie which at the elections to the Dumas and in them tried to rally elements from the various bourgeois-landowner parties and groups under the banner of "independents".

In November 1912, they formed an independent political party with the following programme: a moderate constitution with restricted suffrage, petty reforms, a responsible ministry, i.e., government responsible to the Duma, suppression of the revolutionary movement. During the First World War, the Progressists stepped up their activity, demanding a change of military command, mobilisation of industry for the needs of the front, and a "responsible ministry" with the participation of representatives of the Russian bourgeoisie. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917, some of the party's leaders took part in the bourgeois Provisional Government. Following the October Socialist Revolution, the party carried on active struggle against the Soviets. Among the leaders of the Progressists were the well-known Moscow industrialists P. P. Ryabushinsky and A. I. Konovalov, and the landowner I. N. Yefremov. At various times, the party published its political organs: the journal *Moskovsky Yezhenedelnik* (Moscow Weekly) and the newspapers *Slovo* (Word), *Russkaya Molva* (Russian Tidings), and *Utro Rossii* (Morning of Russia). p. 270

[355] *E. J. Jagiello*—a member of the Polish Socialist Party (P.P.S.); was elected deputy to the Fourth Duma from Warsaw. The Bolsheviks strongly opposed his admission into the Social-Democratic Duma group because he had been elected with the support of the

bourgeoisie and the P.P.S. and Bund bloc. At the first vote, the group split up: six deputies (Mensheviks) voted for his admission, and six (Bolsheviks) against. With the arrival of the Irkutsk deputy the Right-wing Menshevik I. N. Mankov, the Mensheviks obtained the majority, and Jagiello was admitted to the Social-Democratic Duma group. But under the pressure of the Bolshevik deputies, his rights within the group were limited: on all internal Party matters, he had voice but no vote. p. 270

[356] The meeting was held in Cracow from December 26, 1912, to January 1, 1913 (January 8 to 14, 1913). It was attended by V. I. Lenin, N. K. Krupskaya, J. V. Stalin and the Bolshevik deputies to the Fourth Duma, A. Y. Badayev, G. I. Petrovsky, N. R. Shagov, among others. The meeting was also attended by representatives of illegal Party organisations in St. Petersburg, Moscow Region, the South, the Urals and the Caucasus. It was chaired by Lenin, who gave the reports on "The Revolutionary Upswing, the Strikes and the Tasks of the Party" and "On the Attitude to Liquidationism and on Unity" (the text of the reports has not been preserved), and drafted and edited all the resolutions. He also wrote the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee's "Notification" about the meeting (see present edition, Vol. 18, pp. 449-55).

The meeting adopted decisions on the most important aspects of the labour movement: the Party's tasks in connection with the new revolutionary upsurge and the growth of the strike movement, the build-up of the illegal organisation, the work of the Social-Democratic group in the Duma, the insurance campaign, the Party press, the national Social-Democratic organisations, the struggle against liquidationism, and the unity of the proletarian party (see present edition, Vol. 18, pp. 456-66). The decisions were very important in consolidating the Party and its unity, in extending and strengthening the Party's ties with the broad masses of working people and in working out new forms of Party work in the conditions of a mounting working-class movement. The resolutions of the Cracow meeting were approved by the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee. p. 272

[357] A reference to the six Bolsheviks in the Fourth Duma (see Note 208). p. 273

[358] KKK was the code name used to mark articles for obligatory insertion in *Pravda*. In December 1913, the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee reaffirmed the decision: "The resolution to the effect that articles marked with the three agreed letters shall be inserted at once and without change remains in force" (*Istorichesky Arkhiv* No. 4, 1959, p. 42). p. 273

[359] A reference to the legal theoretical Bolshevik monthly *Prosveshcheniye* (Enlightenment) published in St. Petersburg from December 1911 to June 1914. It was set up on Lenin's initiative in place of the Bolshevik journal *Mysl* (Thought), which had been closed down by the tsarist government. The printing reached 5,000 copies. Lenin directed its publication from Paris, and then from

Cracow and Poronin. On the eve of the First World War, it was closed down by the tsarist government. In the autumn of 1917 its publication was resumed, but only one (double) issue appeared. p. 273

[360] The letter was written on March 2 (15), 1913, on assignment from the Cracow meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee with Party functionaries, in a period of sharp struggle waged by the Bolsheviks against the liquidators. It is in reply to the proposal of the German Social-Democratic leaders to call joint conferences of Bolsheviks and liquidators for the purpose of their unification. p. 274

[361] *Vorwärts*—a daily, the Central Organ of the German Social-Democratic Party, published in Berlin from 1891 under a decision of the party's Halle Congress as a continuation of *Berliner Volksblatt*, which had been published from 1884, under the name of *Vorwärts. Berliner Volksblatt*. On its pages, Frederick Engels carried on a struggle against every sign of opportunism. From the latter half of the 1890s, after Engels's death, the paper fell into the hands of the party's Right wing and regularly carried articles by opportunists. It gave a biased view of the struggle against opportunism and revisionism in the R.S.D.L.P. and supported the Economists, and, after the Party split up, the Mensheviks. During the years of reaction, the paper carried Trotsky's slanderous articles, while refusing Lenin and other Bolsheviks the opportunity of issuing refutations and giving an objective assessment of the state of affairs in the Party. During the First World War, it took a social-chauvinist stand; after the October Socialist Revolution it conducted anti-Soviet propaganda. Published in Berlin until 1933. p. 276

[362] *The Transcaucasian* (*Caucasian*) *Regional Committee*—the factional centre of the Caucasian Menshevik liquidators. The Committee was elected at the Fifth Congress of Social-Democratic Organisations of the Transcaucasus in February 1908, which was attended by fifteen Mensheviks and one Bolshevik. The Regional Committee carried on treacherous anti-Party work. Without holding any elections and disregarding the will of the Party organisations, it appointed P. B. Axelrod, F. I. Dan and N. V. Ramishvili as delegates to the Fifth (All-Russia) Conference of the R.S.D.L.P. in 1908. This liquidationist outfit, which claimed to be representative of the workers, was in fact the mainstay of the liquidators Centre Abroad and of Trotsky. In 1812, it joined the anti-Party August bloc set up by Trotsky. p. 276

[363] *O.C.* (*Organising Committee*)—the governing centre of the Mensheviks set up at the August conference of the liquidators in 1912, it operated until the elections to the Menshevik Party's Central Committee in August 1917. p. 276

[364] *P.P.S.—Polska Partia Socjalistyczna* (Polish Socialist Party). *P.S.D.*—Social-Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania (see Notes 52 and 43). p. 277

[365] A reference to the newspaper *Nash Put* (Our Path) published from August 25 (September 7) to September 12 (25), 1913. Lenin took an active part in the paper, sending in his articles simultaneously to *Pravda* and *Nash Put*. Among the articles by Lenin published in *Nash Put* are: "The Russian Bourgeoisie and Russian Reformism", "The Role of Social Estates and Classes in the Liberation Movement", "Class War in Dublin", "A Week after the Dublin Massacre", "Questions of Principle in Politics", and "Harry Quelch".

Among those who contributed to *Nash Put* were Maxim Gorky, Demyan Bedny, M. S. Olminsky, I. I. Skvortsov-Stepanov, J. V. Stalin and the Bolshevik deputies to the Fourth Duma, A. Y. Badayev, F. N. Samoilov and N. R. Shagov. The paper enjoyed wide popularity among the workers; 395 workers' groups made contributions to run the paper. p. 279

[366] *Russkaya Molva* (Russian Tidings)—a daily of the bourgeois-landowner party of Progressists published in St. Petersburg from December 9 (22), 1912, to August 20 (September 2), 1913. p. 283

[367] *The Geneva conference of Mensheviks* was held simultaneously with the Third Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. in April 1905. In view of the small number of participants (only delegates from nine committees) the Mensheviks declared it to be a conference of Party functionaries.

Its decisions showed that the Mensheviks did not set themselves the task of carrying forward the revolution. They denied the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution and the policy of alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry. They believed the liberal bourgeoisie to be the leader in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, which was to take over after the revolution won out. The Mensheviks denied the need for a provisional revolutionary government and participation of Social-Democrats in it. In its decisions on an armed uprising, the conference failed to set out the practical tasks facing the proletariat. The Mensheviks believed that the proletarian party should not take part in preparing the uprising for fear of scaring off the bourgeoisie. The conference came out against Social-Democratic participation in a provisional revolutionary government. It did not set the task of organising revolutionary peasant committees to seize the landed estates, leaving the solution of the agrarian problem to a future Constituent Assembly. The conference decisions on the organisational question, expressed in the "organisational Rules", dragged the Party back from the Second Congress to organisational fragmentation and clannishness. Lenin exposed the opportunist character of these decisions and subjected them to withering criticism in his article "A Third Step Back", his work *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, and in the "Preface to the Pamphlet *Workers on the Split in the Party*" (see present edition, Vol. 8, pp. 544-54, Vol. 9, pp. 15-140 and 163-68). p. 287

[368] A reference to the nationalist and chauvinist stand taken by the Octobrists, Progressists and Cadets during the debate in the Fourth

Duma in May 1913 of the estimates for the Ministry of the Interior. For details, see present edition, Vol. 36, pp. 249-50, 251-52. p. 289

[369] The legal Bolshevik Priboi Publishers was set up in St. Petersburg in early 1913 and operated under the direction of the Party's Central Committee. It responded to various questions of the working-class movement. Emerging during the "insurance campaign" it issued many publications on workers' social insurance. Subsequently, on instructions from the Party's C.C., it devoted much attention to the issue of popular agitation and propaganda pamphlets on socio-political and Party questions. In view of the intensified persecution of the workers' press by the tsarist government at the start of the First World War, Priboi had to cease its activity and resumed it only in March 1917. In 1918, it was integrated with Kommunist Publishers, which had been set up as a merger of several publishing houses (Volna, Zhizn i Znaniye, etc.). p. 291

[370] *Russkiye Vedomosti* (Russian Recorder)—a newspaper published in Moscow from 1863, expressing the views of the moderate liberal intelligentsia. In the 1880s and 1880s, contributors to the paper included writers from the democratic camp (V. G. Korolenko, M. Y. Saltykov-Shchedrin and G. I. Uspensky, among others); it also carried the works of the liberal Narodniks. From 1905, the paper was the organ of the Right wing of the Cadet Party. Lenin said that the paper was a unique combination of "*Right* Cadetism and Narodnik overtones" (see present edition, Vol. 19, p. 135). In 1918, the newspaper was closed down along with the other counter-revolutionary newspapers. p. 294

[371] A reference to B. G. Dansky (K. A. Komarovsky). He joined the R.S.D.L.P. in 1911, contributed articles to *Zvezda* and *Pravda* and took part in the insurance movement; in 1913 and 1914, he was on the Editorial Board of the Bolshevik journal *Voprosy Strakhovaniya*. In order to discredit the Bolsheviks, the liquidators accused Dansky of writing for the bourgeois press. A Party commission consisting of representatives of the Editorial Boards of the newspaper *Za Pravdu* and the journals *Prosveshcheniye* and *Voprosy Strakhovaniya*, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group in the Duma, and Priboi Publishers examined the facts and established that after joining the Bolshevik Party Dansky had ceased writing for the bourgeois press; accordingly, it declared him to be an honest Party member, and the liquidators' charges, libellous. Lenin also wrote about the case later, in the report of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee at the Brussels Conference (see present edition, Vol. 20, p. 524). p. 296

[372] For reasons of secrecy this was called a summer conference but actually it was held from September 23 to October 1 (October 6 to 14), 1913, in the village of Poronin, near Cracow, where Lenin then lived. On its agenda were the following questions: 1) reports from the localities, report on the work of the Social-Democracy of Poland and Lithuania, report on the work of the C.C. elected

at the Prague Conference; 2) the tasks of agitation at the present moment; 3) organisational question and the Party congress; 4) strike movement; 5) Party press; 6) Social-Democratic work in the Duma; 7) Social-Democratic Duma group; 8) work in legal societies; 9) national question; 10) Narodniks; 11) the forthcoming International Socialist Congress (in Vienna). Lenin directed the Conference. He delivered the opening speech, gave the report on the work of the Central Committee, the report on the national question, and on the forthcoming International Socialist Congress in Vienna. He also spoke on almost all the questions of the agenda, kept a record of speeches by delegates from local Party organisations, motioned proposals, drafted and edited resolutions. The text of the report on the work of the C.C. has not been discovered. A brief summary of some points from the report is given in A. Y. Badayev's reminiscences.

Two resolutions, written by Lenin, were adopted on the C.C. report and the reports from the localities: "The Tasks of Agitation in the Present Situation" and "On the Organisational Question and on the Party Congress", which determined the Party's tasks and the main forms of Party work in the new historical conditions. One of the main questions at the Conference was the national question, which at the time was among the most prominent in Russia's social life. In his report on the national question, Lenin emphasised that the struggle against national oppression was indissolubly bound up with the struggle against tsarism, for freedom and democracy. The Conference, on the strength of the Party Programme, resolutely rejected the opportunist demand of the Mensheviks and the Bundists for "cultural-national autonomy" and adopted the propositions on the national question worked out by Lenin. He regarded the resolution on the national question as a declaration of the Party Programme on this issue. The Conference decided to include the quotation of a national programme on the agenda of the next Party congress.

In its resolution on the Social-Democratic Duma group, the Conference demanded equality for the Bolshevik and the Menshevik sections and resolutely condemned the actions of the Menshevik section, which made use of its chance majority of one vote and was violating the elementary rights of the Bolshevik deputies, who represented the vast majority of Russia's workers. On instructions from Lenin and the C.C. of the Bolshevik Party, the Bolshevik deputies left the joint Social-Democratic group in the Duma in October 1913 and set up their own Bolshevik group (the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group).

In his report on the International Socialist Congress, which was to be held in Vienna in 1914, Lenin proposed that as many delegates as possible should be sent from the illegal and legal organisations, for it was intended to hold a Party congress simultaneously with the International Socialist Congress.

Lenin delivered the summing-up speech. In view of the importance of the questions discussed and the decisions adopted, the Poronin Conference had the significance of a Party conference.

The minutes of the Conference have not been found. The announcement of the Conference and the resolutions it adopted were published in a separate pamphlet abroad as a Central Committee publication (*Izveshcheniye i rezolutsii letnego 1913 goda soveshchaniya Tsentralnogo Komiteta R.S.D.R.P. s partiinymi rabotnikami*) (Announcement and Resolutions of the Conference held by the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. and Party functionaries in the Summer of 1913). For reasons of secrecy, some of the resolutions were published in part: point 6 of the resolution on the strike movement and points 1-5 on the Party press were omitted. The full text of the resolutions was printed in an illegal hectographed publication. There are police department records of the Conference, of which the details were supplied by the provocateurs Malinovsky and Lobov. About the Conference see present edition, Vol. 19, pp. 417-31.

Lenin sent an outline of the report to be made in the localities to St. Petersburg on November 29 (December 12), 1913. The outline was drawn up for the Bolshevik deputies of the Fourth Duma, as a guide for their reports about the Conference to be made to local Party workers during the Christmas recess. p. 297

[373] *Voprosy Strakhovaniya* (Problems of Insurance)—a legal Bolshevik journal Published in St. Petersburg from October 1913 to March 1918 with interruptions. It waged a struggle not only for workers' insurance but also for Bolshevik "uncurtailed slogans"—an eight-hour working day, confiscation of landed estates and a democratic republic. Among those who took part in the journal were prominent leaders of the insurance campaign, the Bolsheviks N. A. Skrypnik, P. I. Stučka, A. N. Vinokurov and N. M. Shvernik. p. 298

[374] *The December session of the International Socialist Bureau* was held in London on December 13 and 14, 1913, and discussed the unification of the British socialist and labour parties, the Vienna Congress, Russian affairs, etc. The question of uniting the Social-Democratic Party in Russia was brought up for debate just before the session closed. In view of the late hour, the question was not discussed in detail, and the Bureau confined itself to adopting a resolution motioned by Kautsky on behalf of the German delegation. It authorised the Executive Committee of the I.S.B. to call a conference of representatives of "all the factions of the working-class movement in Russia, including Russian Poland, who accept the Party Programme or whose programmes are in accord with the Social-Democratic Programme, for an exchange of opinion (Aussprache) over the issues on which they are divided". Motivating the resolution, Kautsky said on December 1 (14) that the old Social-Democratic Party in Russia was dead. It was necessary to revive it, relying on the Russian workers' desire for unity. In his article "A Good Resolution and a Bad Speech", Lenin analysed the content of the resolution and said Kautsky's speech was a monstrous one (see present edition, Vol. 19, pp. 528-30). Writing to Inessa Armand of the issue of *Vorwärts* which carried

Kautsky's statement, Lenin said: "You should get hold of it ... and organise a protest campaign. We are *for* an exchange of opinion, *for* the resolution of the I.S.B.—**this NB**—but we are absolutely against Kautsky's **scoundrelly** phrase. He should be beaten unmercifully for this" (present edition, Vol. 35, p. 130). In a letter to the Bolshevik section in Paris, Lenin wrote: "It is most desirable that the *section* should adopt a *slashing* resolution against Kautsky (calling his statement about the Party's death *shameless*, *brazen*, *monstrous*, *ignorant*)" (Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*, Vol. 48, p. 254).

The same sitting of the I.S.B. on December 1 (14) heard Plekhanov's letter saying that the split in the Duma group, which had taken place through the fault of the liquidators, was a blow at the unity of the labour movement and led him to resign as the representative of the whole Party in the I.S.B. His place on the I.S.B. was taken by P. B. Axelrod, a representative of the liquidationist Organising Committee.

At the conference held in Brussels in July 1914, under the I.S.B. decision, the leaders of the Second International, on the pretext of "reconciling" the Bolsheviks and the liquidators, demanded that the Bolsheviks should stop criticising the latter. The Bolsheviks refused to do so and continued their relentless struggle against the liquidators, who were enemies of the labour movement. p. 299

[375] Lenin wrote the article in connection with the All-Russia Congress on Public Education which was to be held in St. Petersburg during the winter holidays at the end of December 1913. The Bolsheviks wanted to use the Congress as a legal opportunity for spreading Bolshevik ideas and revolutionary demands. The article is closely connected with Lenin's "The Question of Ministry of Education Policy" (see present edition, Vol. 19, pp. 137-46). p. 300

[376] The question of the Vienna congress was discussed by the International Socialist Bureau in December 1913. It was decided to call the Congress in August 1914, timing it to coincide with the celebrations of the 50th anniversary of the First International. The following questions were entered on its agenda: 1) high cost of living; 2) imperialism and the struggle against militarism, which included as subquestions: a) the Eastern question; b) compulsory courts of arbitration between nations and c) United States of Europe; 3) alcoholism; 4) unemployment; 5) condition of political prisoners and exiles in Russia; and 6) miscellaneous. No country was to have a delegation numbering more than six times the number of its votes; hence, Russia, with 20 votes, could have no more than 120 delegates for both subsections of the Social-Democrats and the Left Narodniks and the trade unions together.

The question of the International Socialist Congress in Vienna was discussed at the Poronin Conference of the C.C. with Party functionaries. Lenin, reporting on the question, proposed that all measures should be taken to have Social-Democratic workers in a majority as delegates to the Vienna Congress. By the end of July 1914, the elections to the International Socialist Congress

were almost completed, but the outbreak of the world war prevented the Congress from being held. p. 305

[377] *Novaya Rabochaya Gazeta* (New Workers' Newspaper)—a daily of the Menshevik liquidators published in St. Petersburg in place of *Zhivaya Zhizn* (Living Life) from August 8 (21), 1913, to January 23 (February 5), 1914. Lenin repeatedly called it "New Liquidators' Newspaper". p. 306

[378] A reference to the article by I. Vetrov (M. A. Savelyev), "The International and the Question of Unity", published in No. 1 of the newspaper *Proletarskaya Pravda* (Proletarian Truth) of December 7 (20), 1913, which said: "In conclusion, we feel bound to point out the lie of the liquidators, who insist that in denying the Six special representation, the Bureau allegedly condemned the principle of 'federation', put forward by the six workers' deputies in the Social-Democratic group. The demand for special representation for the Six was not at all presented to the Bureau for purely formal reasons; this shows that N.R.G.'s statements to the effect that the Bureau had issued a condemnation of the Six is part of the dishonest lying of the liquidators in their continued efforts to dim the consciousness of the working class." p. 306

[379] The theses were apparently written by Lenin after his lecture in Paris on January 10 (23), 1914 (see *Lenin Miscellany XXX*, pp. 51-57). The inscription on the cover of the "National Question III" notebook is an indication that Lenin repeated his Paris lecture at Liége on February 2, 1914. p. 313

[380] Lenin analyses Kautsky's pamphlet *Nationalität und Internationalität* (Nationality and Internationality) in his work *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination* (see present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 397-99). p. 314

[381] See Lenin's extract from the book *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Fr. Engels u. K. Marx*, Bd. IV, Stuttgart, 1913, S. 292, in *Lenin Miscellany XVII*, p. 291 (cf. Marx's letter to Engels, written on July 5, 1870). p. 319

[382] At the third sitting of the Programme Committee of the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P., the delegate of the Social-Democracy of Poland and Lithuania motioned the adoption of the item on guarantees for "freedom of cultural development of all nations making up the state" (see Lenin's note of it in *Lenin Miscellany VI*, p. 105). p. 319

[383] *Diaspora* (Gk. for dispersal)—the Jews living outside Judea. In the early 6th century B.C., there were Jewish communities in Egypt, Babylon and other countries of the Mediterranean. From the 3rd century B.C., the Diaspora grew rapidly, so that in the 1st century B.C., their number came to 4.5 million. In the Roman Empire, the Jews lived in communities, sometimes forming public-law corporations (as in Alexandria), or private religious societies (as in Rome). On the one hand, the Jews of the Diaspora successfully conducted the propaganda of Judaism, and on the other, they

were gradually losing their national traits and language. p. 322

[384] "*Federation of the worst type*" was the term used in the decisions of the Prague Party Conference of 1912 to characterise the relations with non-Russian national Social-Democratic organisations in the R.S.D.L.P. after the Fourth (Unity) Congress, when the "non-Russians" worked "in total isolation from Russian organisations", which had an extremely negative effect on the whole work of the R.S.D.L.P. While the Social-Democratic organisations of Poland and Lithuania, the Latvian Territory and the Bund were formally part of the R.S.D.L.P., the actually held themselves aloof. Their representatives did not take part in the direction of Party work throughout Russia, and promoted, directly or indirectly, the anti-Party activity of the liquidators (see present edition, Vol. 17, pp. 464-65, and Vol. 18, pp. 411-12). p. 323

[385] *The Fourth Social-Democratic Congress of the Latvian Territory* was held in Brussels from January 13 to 26 (January 26 to February 8), 1914.

Lenin took an active part in preparing and holding the Congress. He gave a report on the attitude of the Social-Democracy of the Latvian Territory to the R.S.D.L.P. and to the split in the Duma group, and took part in conferences of Bolshevik delegates, helping them to draft resolutions. On the eve of the Congress, January 12 (25), Lenin gave a lecture for the delegates on the national question, setting out the relevant Bolshevik theory and tactics. Lenin urged the Marxists of Latvia to strengthen the Party's real—instead of imaginary—unity and keep its ranks clean of vacillators and liquidators, who were patent traitors to the working-class cause. He made wide we of the resolutions of the Fourth Congress to fight the liquidators and Trotskyites. See his articles "The Lettish Workers and the Split in the Social-Democratic Group in the Duma", "The 'August' Fiction Exposed", "The Liquidators and the Lettish Working-Class Movement" (see present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 177-81, 182-85, 239-41) and others. Thanks to the persistent struggle against the conciliatory tendencies conducted by Lenin and the Latvian Bolsheviks at the Congress, the Latvian Social-Democrats withdrew from the August bloc, and this, Lenin said, was a "death blow" at the Trotskyite association.

The minutes of the Congress have not been discovered, but it is known that they were prepared for publication by Janson-Braun and were left in Brussels. At the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee, there are, in the Poronin-Cracow material, Lenin's writings relating to the Congress and characterising the struggle waged by him and the Bolshevik section of the Congress against the liquidators. Among the documents is a record of the agenda in Lenin's hand, notes on the sittings and speeches, and also a draft resolution on the attitude of the Latvian Social-Democrats to the R.S.D.L.P., an outline of the report and the summing-up speech. Of great interest are Lenin's notes on the speeches and his commentaries. There is, for instance, a note on Braun's speech

on January 15 (28), 1914. Where Braun says, in justification of his conciliatory stand, that it is "a very fine point", Lenin writes: "*That's where it's liable to break*!" p. 324

[386] A reference to the liquidators' conference held in Vienna in August 1912; it formalised the anti-Party August bloc, which was organised by Trotsky. It was attended by representatives of the Bund, the Transcaucasian Regional Committee, the Social-Democracy of the Latvian Territory and groups of liquidators, Trotskyites and otzovists abroad (the Editorial Boards of *Golos Sotsial-Demokrata* and Trotsky's Vienna *Pravda*, and the *Vperyod* group). Delegates from Russia were sent by the St. Petersburg and Moscow "initiating groups" of liquidators, the Krasnoyarsk organisation, the Sebastopol Social-Democratic Military Organisation, the Editorial Boards of the liquidators' publications, *Nasha Zarya* and *Nevsky Golos*; it was also attended by a representative of the Spilka Committee Abroad. The overwhelming majority were resident abroad, were out of touch with the working class in Russia, and not connected directly with local Party work in Russia.

The conference adopted anti-Party, liquidationist decisions on all questions of Social-Democratic tactics and came out against the existence of the illegal Party. The liquidators' attempt to set up their own, Centrist party in Russia was not supported by the workers. The liquidators failed to elect a Central Committee and confined themselves to setting up an Organising Committee. The anti-Bolshevik bloc, consisting of diverse elements, which it was the main task of the conference to set up, began to fall apart before the conference was over. See Lenin's articles "The Break-up of the 'August' Bloc", "The 'August' Fiction Exposed", "Disruption of Unity Under Cover of Outcries for Unity" (present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 158-61, 182-85, 325-47). p. 326

[387] The Resolution on Setting up an Organisational Section of the Central Committee to direct illegal Work was adopted by the C.C. at its sittings held in Cracow from April 2 to 4 (15 to 17), 1914, under Lenin's direction and with the participation of G. I. Petrovsky, representing the Bolshevik Duma group, who had arrived from Russia. The C.C. examined the questions of preparing for the convocation of the next R.S.D.L.P. congress, marking Workers' Press Day, work among the peasants, work in the Duma and report of the Bolshevik Duma group, the International Women's Conference, the Vienna Congress of the Second International, preparation of leaflets for May Day, etc.

In connection with the discussion of the question of setting up the Organisational Section of the Central Committee to direct illegal Work and the adoption of a resolution on this question, Lenin proposed that prominent Party workers—among them M. I. Kalinin and A. S. Kiselyov—and workers who took an active part in the insurance movement should be included in the Section. Apart from the resolution published here, there is also an outline of the agenda of the C.C. sittings worked out by Lenin. On the

question of the R.S.D.L.P. C.C. report to the Vienna Congress of the Second International, the C.C. decided to "instruct the C.C. members abroad to engage in drawing up the report". This was done by Lenin. In April-May 1914, he wrote his "Plan and Outline for a Report of the R.S.D.L.P. C.C. to the Vienna Congress of the Second International" (see Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 441-44). p. 330

[388] The *Party congress* was to be timed to coincide with the International Socialist Congress in Vienna, set for August 1914. An Organising Commission was set up under the Russian Collegium of the C.C. to prepare for the congress. It was also decided to set up commissions in Moscow, the Caucasus, the South and the Urals. The congress was to be preceded by organisational tours of local Party organisations by C.C. agents, and also by trips to the localities of the Bolshevik deputies to the Duma. The preparations for the congress were especially intensive in the spring and summer of 1914. The agenda and even the composition of the congress were determined. It was to discuss the following questions: reports of the C.C. and reports from the localities, the political situation, the Party's organisational tasks, the tasks of the strike movement, the tactics of the insurance movement, some addenda to the minimum programme, the national question, the liquidators in connection with the conference under the I.S.B., participation in the bourgeois press and other urgent problems of the time. By the end of July 1914, preparations for the congress and elections to the International Socialist Congress were almost complete. Most of the delegates were elected, the instructions drawn up and the mandates collected. The technical side—secret meeting places, routes and passports—was also ready. But the outbreak of war and the wild reaction that followed worked a sharp change in the situation in the country. The closure of the frontiers cut off communications with all other countries. The congress was postponed until a more favourable moment. Nor was the International Congress able to meet in these circumstances. Although the Party congress did not take place, preparation for it had a great part to play in strengthening and consolidating the Party organisations. p. 331

[389] The statistical studies by I. M. Kozminykh-Lanin repeatedly drew Lenin's attention. In August 1912, Lenin wrote two reviews on his *Working Day and Working Year in Moscow Gubernia*, entitled "The Working Day in the Factories of Moscow Gubernia" and "The Working Day and Working Year in Moscow Gubernia". The first was published in *Pravda*, the second in *Nevskaya Zvezda* in August 1912 (see present edition, Vol. 18, pp. 260-61, 262-69). Lenin used the author's statistical data in his article "The Language of Figures", published in September 1913 in the Moscow newspaper *Nash Put* (see present edition, Vol. 19, pp. 358-63). In the first of the above-mentioned reviews Lenin wrote that the statistician had prepared a special work on overtime at Moscow Gubernia factories, and the article given here is a review of this latter work, which was published in 1914. p. 331

[390] The conference, called by the Executive Committee of the I.S.B. in accordance with the decision of the December 1913 session of the I.S.B., was held from July 16 to 18, 1914. It was attended by representatives of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks) Central Committee; the Organising Committee (Mensheviks) with its affiliated organisations (Caucasian Regional Committee and the *Borba* group [Trotskyites]); the Social-Democratic Duma group (Mensheviks); Plekhanov's *Yedinstvo* group; the *Vperyod* group; the Bund, the Social-Democracy of the Latvian Territory; the Social-Democracy of Lithuania; the Polish Social-Democrats; the Polish Social-Democratic Opposition, and the P.P.S.-Lewica. The delegation of the R.S.D.L.P. C.C. consisted of Inessa Armand (Petrova), M. F. Vladimirsky (Kamsky) and I. F. Popov (Pavlov). Lenin thoroughly prepared the delegation for the conference: he wrote a report and detailed instructions for it, provided it with the necessary material, documents and factual data which exposed the true face of Russia's opportunists and their sponsors.

From the outset there was a sharp struggle between the Bolsheviks and the Russian and international opportunists. On Kautsky's motion, the conference approved the following agenda: 1) Programme differences. 2) Tactical differences. 3) Organisational question. Despite the fact that the conference was to be limited to an exchange of opinion, Vandervelde warned that it would adopt decisions on all three items of the agenda. The C.C. delegation, guided by Lenin's instructions, motioned that the conference should hear the delegations' reports and suggestions concerning the concrete conditions which each considered necessary to ensure unity. Thanks to the insistence of the Bolsheviks it was decided to depart from the adopted agenda and to go on to reports on the controversial questions and to the formulations of the concrete conditions for unity.

At the centre of the conference's work was a report of the R.S.D.L.P. C.C., prepared by Lenin and read out by Inessa Armand in French at the morning sitting of July 17. The leaders of the I.S.B. did not allow her to read out the entire report, so she had to summarise a part of it and then go on to stating the terms for unity. Intent on defending the liquidators, the I.S.B. leaders were greatly irritated at the concrete proposals of the Bolsheviks on the terms for unity. On behalf of the I.S.B., Kautsky motioned a resolution which asserted that there were no essential differences among the Russian Social-Democrats hindering their unity. He was supported by the O.C. and Plekhanov, who made fierce attacks against the C.C. delegation and Lenin. An erroneous stand was taken by Rosa Luxemburg, who joined Plekhanov, Vandervelde, Kautsky and others in urging a union of the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. Since the motioning of the resolution was outside the powers of the conference, the Bolsheviks and the Latvian Social-Democrats refused to participate in the vote on it. But a majority adopted the resolution. The Polish opposition, although it supported the Bolsheviks and the Latvian Social-Democrats at the conference, voted for the I.S.B. resolution.

(See Lenin's article "The Polish Social-Democratic Opposition at the Parting of the Ways", present edition, Vol. 20, pp. 556-57.)

The Bolsheviks, guided by Lenin, refused to abide by the decisions of the Brussels conference. The attempt on the part of the opportunist leaders of the Second International to liquidate the Bolshevik Party was a failure. In the face of the international proletariat, Lenin and the Bolsheviks exposed the true aims of the leaders of the International parading as peace-makers.

At a private conference of liquidators, Trotskyites, *Vperyod* supporters, Plekhanovites, Bundists and representatives of the Caucasian Regional Organisation, held after the Brussels conference, these groups set up a bloc against the Bolsheviks. The Brussels (July Third) bloc was a hypocritical cover-up for the politically rotten positions of all its participants; the bloc's break-up soon after showed the falsity of the policy propounded by the Russian and West-European "unifiers" of the R.S.D.L.P. p. 334

[391] The item was intended for the newspaper *Trudovaya Pravda*. In the margin of the page on which it is written, Lenin made a note for the editors: "Set this thing in brevier, and do not print any replies to their letters, nothing at all: let them all go to their new 'brothers by bloc'".

The item was not published as the newspaper was closed down on July 8 (21), 1914. p. 334

[392] These plans reveal the content of the article "Revolution and War" which Lenin planned to write for No. 33 of the Party's C.O., the newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat*. The plans were written in July 1914 after the outbreak of war between Austria and Serbia.

The revolutionary crisis coming to a head in Russia on the eve of the war was most evident in July 1914, a period Lenin compared with January 1905, pointing to the growth of a massive revolutionary movement, led by the illegal proletarian party, the growth of slogans providing ideological unity for the Party's propaganda and agitation. The revolutionary struggle was conducted under the slogans for an eight-hour working day, confiscation of landed estates and a democratic republic.

The plans show that the powerful growth of the revolutionary movement in Russia was seen by Lenin in the content of the international situation, and that in his article "Revolution and War" he intended to deal with the tasks facing the proletariat of Russia in connection with the world situation. p. 335

[393] *Kievskaya Mysl* (Kiev Thought)—a bourgeois-democratic daily published in Kiev from 1906 to 1918. Until 1915, it had illustrated weekly supplements; from 1917, it had morning and evening editions. p. 335

[394] This is written on a separate page and is marked as an insertion, but there is no indication which particular article it belongs to. It may well be a variant of the insertion to the R.S.D.L.P. C.C. manifesto "The War and the Social-Democracy of Russia", or to a Bolshevik resolution on the war. p. 337

[395] A reference to the Extraordinary International Socialist Congress held at Basle on November 24 and 25, 1912. It was called to decide on the question of fighting the looming danger of an imperialist world war, a danger; that was intensified by the outbreak of the First Balkan War. The Congress was attended by 555 delegates. The R.S.D.L.P. C.C. sent 6 delegates. On the opening day, there was a massive anti-war demonstration and an international rally against war.

On November 25, the Congress unanimously adopted a Manifesto on war. It warned the nations against the threat of an impending world war, exposed the plunderous aims of the war being prepared by the imperialists, urged workers in all countries to wage a resolute struggle for peace, against the threat of war, and to "confront capitalist imperialism with the might of the international solidarity of the proletariat". In the event of an imperialist war, the Manifesto advised socialists to use the economic and political crisis caused by the war to struggle for a socialist revolution.

The leaders of the Second International (Kautsky, Vandervelde and others) voted for the Manifesto, but with the outbreak of the world war they forgot all about the Basle Manifesto and the other decisions of international socialist congresses on the struggle against war, and sided with their imperialist governments. p. 337

[396] Lenin began work on the pamphlet soon after his arrival in Berne. He collected extensive material but the pamphlet was not written. He used some of the preparatory material in his lectures, articles published in *Sotsial-Demokrat*, and in the pamphlet *Socialism and War*. This is the fullest plan of the pamphlet, all the preparatory material being given in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, pp. 14-123. p. 337

[397] A reference to Victor Adler's speech in the International Socialist Bureau in Brussels on July 29, 1914. Lenin deals with it in his "Dead Chauvinism and Living Socialism" (see present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 94-101). p. 338

[398] A reference to the book by Jean Jaurès, *L'organisation socialiste de la France. L'Armée nouvelle* (Socialist Organisation in France. New Arm), published in Paris in 1911. p. 338

[399] A reference to Hermann Wendel's article "Jaurès" published in *Die Neue Zeit* No. 19 of August 21, 1914. p. 338

[400] A quotation from Karl Kautsky's article "Die Sozialdemokratie im Krieg" (Social-Democracy in Wartime) published in No. 1 of *Die Neue Zeit* of October 2, 1914. Lenin criticised the article in "Dead Chauvinism and Living Socialism" (see present edition Vol. 21, pp. 94-101). p. 339

[401] A reference to Hermann Wendel's article "Europa in Feuersgefahr" (Europe Threatened with Conflagration), carried in No. 18 of *Die Neue Zeit* of July 31, 1914. There are extracts from the article with Lenin's remarks in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, pp. 47-49. p. 339

[402] A reference to the article "Ultimatum" published in No. 200

of *Vorwärts* on July 25, 1914; the note "Verdechtige Tiranentöter!" (Suspicious Tyrant Killers!) published in the supplement to No. 174 of *Leipziger Volkszeitung* on July 31, 1914, and the article "Der Kampf gegen den Zarismus" (The Struggle Against Tsarism) published in No. 209 of *Vorwärts* on August 3, 1914. p. 339

[403] A reference to R. Fischer's article "Vandalen" (Vandals) published in No. 206 of *Volksrecht* on September 5, 1914. Lenin's extracts from the article are in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 61. p. 339

[404] Upon the outbreak of war, some members of the Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. Organisations Abroad, which had its seat in Paris, and some members of the Bolshevik section in Paris—N. I. Sapozhkov (Kuznetsov) and A. V. Britman (Antonov), among others—joined the Mensheviks and S.R.s in adopting a declaration on behalf of "Russian republicans", which they published in the French press, and went to the front. *L'Humanité* also carried a statement by Polish Social-Democratic volunteers. p. 339

[405] No. 9 of *Golos* on September 22, 1914, carried the text of a social-chauvinist declaration by Polish socialists signed by Leder, Kon, Sehnenbaum and others. p. 339

[406] *Sovremennoye Slovo* (Contemporary Word)—a daily published by the Cadets in St. Petersburg from 1907 to 1918. The reference here is to Lenin's extracts from the item "G. V. Plekhanov about the War" in No. 2374 of *Sovremennoye Slovo* on August 23 (September 5), 1914 (see *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 114). p. 339

[407] A reference to the "Press Review" section in No. 3 of *Golos* on September 15, 1914, containing an extract from Ghesquière's social-chauvinist article "Notre devoir" (Our Duty) published in No. 3802 of *L'Humanité* on September 14, 1914. It tried to justify the social-chauvinist policy of the leadership of the French Socialist Party in the imperialist war and its abandonment of the class struggle, and stated that the French socialists would do their socialist duty when the war was over. The *Golos* editors appended an editorial note confirming that *Vorwärts* and G. V. Plekhanov took the same attitude. p. 339

[408] A reference to the article by Y. Smirnov (Gurevich), "The War and European Democracy", published in No. 202 of *Russkiye Vedomosti* on September 3 (16), 1914, and P. Maslov's letter to the editor of the paper, published under the caption "The War and Trade Agreements" in No. 207 of the paper on September 10 (23), 1914. p. 339

[409] A reference to Edouard Vaillant's article "Formalistes doctrinaires" (Doctrinaire Formalists), written in reply to the letters he received from socialists criticising his social-chauvinist stand. It was run as an editorial in No. 3827 of *L'Humanité* on October 9, 1914. Lenin's extracts from it are in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 97. p. 340

[410] A reference to Compère-Morel's article "Les commissaires à la

nation" (People's Commissars) published in No. 3788 of *L'Humanité* on August 31, 1914. Lenin's extracts from the article are in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 67. p. 340

[411] A reference to Gustave Hervé's articles vindicating the alliance between republican France and tsarist Russia. He said that France could not do without an alliance with the tsar in the War, and that tsarism was allegedly improving under the influence of democratic Britain and democratic Italy. p. 340

[412] H. M. Hyndman had come out in open defence of imperialism even before the war, and had been sharply criticised by the German Social-Democrats and their organ *Die Neue Zeit*. p. 340

[413] A reference to the social-chauvinist declaration issued by the Social-Democratic group and read out by the Socialist H. Haase in the Reichstag on August 4, 1914, during the voting of the war credits. p. 340

[414] A reference to Eduard Bernstein's article "Abrechnung mit Russland" (Squaring Accounts with Russia) published in No. 232 of *Vorwärts* on August 26, 1914. Quoting Engels's *Savoyen, Nizza und der Rhein* (Savoy, Nice and the Rhine), which spoke of the threat of a Franco-Russian alliance for Germany, out of context, Bernstein tried to justify the opportunist policy of the German Social-Democratic leaders in the imperialist war. Lenin's extracts from Engels's work are in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, pp. 41-43. p. 340

[415] A reference to Engels's "Der Sozialismus in Deutschland" (Socialism in Germany) published in No. 19 of *Die Neue Zeit*, Vol. 1, 1891-92, which the German social-chauvinists tried to use to vindicate their opportunist stand in the imperialist war. p. 340

[416] A reference to Franz Mehring's protest, which exposed the attempts on the part of German social-chauvinists to justify their opportunist policy in the imperialist war by references to Engels. p. 340

[417] No. 211 of *Hamburger Echo* on September 10, 1914, carried an article "Eine notwendige Erklärung" (A Necessary Explanation), which distorted Engels's article "Der Sozialismus in Deutschland" in order to justify the social-chauvinist stand of the German Social-Democratic leadership. For Lenin's extracts from the newspaper see *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 67.

No. 249 of *Vorwärts* on September 12, 1914, carried an article "Die Auffassung der italienischen Sozialisten" (The Standpoint of the Italian Socialists). p. 340

[418] A reference to the article by the German social-chauvinist R. Fischer, "Vandalen" (Vandals), which was published in No. 206 of *Volksrecht* on September 5, 1914, and the reply to him—"Letter from a German Socialist", which was apparently intended for publication in *Berner Tagwacht*. There are extracts from the letter made by Lenin, with this note in the margin: "((pp. 1-7)) (typewritten, to the editors of *Berner Tagwacht*)" (see *Lenin Miscellany XIV*,

pp. 61-63). But the letter was not published in the newspaper. Extracts from it were published in a leading article "Die Sozialdemokratie und der Krieg" (Social-Democracy and the War) in *Grütlianer* Nos. 213 and 214 on September 13 and 14, 1914. p. 340

[419] A quotation from an article by Joseph Bloch, "Der Krieg und Sozialdemokratie" (The War and Social-Democracy), which was published in No. 16 of *Sozialistische Monatshefte*. p. 340

[420] No. 12 of *Golos* on September 25, 1914, carried an item "Press Review" containing a summary of Karl Liebknecht's letter, which was published in *Bremer Bürger-Zeitung* and dealt with the Social-Democratic voting of the war credits in the Reichstag. p. 340

[421] A reference to the protest issued by the Left-wing Social-Democrats and published in No. 214 of the *Bremer Bürger-Zeitung* on September 14, 1914, and to the article "Parteipflichten" (Party Duties) published in the Social-Democratic paper *Volksblatt* No. 220 of September 19, 1914. They voiced protests against the social-chauvinist policy of the German Social-Democratic leadership, declared that not all Social-Democrats shared the leadership's opinion, and emphasised a desire for international solidarity.

Bremer Bürger-Zeitung—a Social-Democratic daily published in Bremen from 1890 to 1919; until 1916 it was under the influence of Bremen Left-wing Social-Democrats, but then passed into the hands of social-chauvinists. p. 341

[422] A reference to the stand taken by the German Social-Democratic newspaper *Volksblatt*, which was published in Halle. It criticised the social-chauvinist stand of the German Social-Democratic leadership and urged international solidarity. p. 341

[423] A reference to the article "Die Zertrümmerte Internationale" (Destroyed International) published in No. 211 of *Bremer Bürger-Zeitung* on September 10, 1914. Lenin's extracts from the newspaper are in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 83. p. 341

[424] *Volksrecht*—a daily, the organ of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland, published in Zurich since 1898. During the First World War (1914-18), the paper carried articles by Left-wing Social-Democrats. It published Lenin's articles: "Twelve Brief Theses on H. Greulich's Defence of Fatherland", "The Tasks of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party in the Russian Revolution", "Tricks of the Republican Chauvinists" and others.

Lenin is referring to the article "Zwei Internationalen" (Two Internationals) published in No. 211 of *Volksrecht* on September 11, 1914. Lenin's extracts from the article are in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 58. p. 341

[425] A reference to the manifesto issued by the French and Belgian delegations in the I.S.B. to the German people. It was carried in No. 3794 of *L'Humanité* on September 6, 1914, and accused the German Government of aggressive designs, and the German soldiers, of atrocities on occupied territory. The Executive of the

German Social-Democratic Party published a protest against the manifesto in No. 247 of *Vorwärts* on September 10. There followed a press polemic between the French and German social-chauvinists, with both sides trying to justify their government's part in the war and putting the blame on the other governments. p. 341

[426] A reference to L. Martov's letter to G. Hervé, which was published in No. 12 of *Golos* on September 25, 1914. p. 341

[427] A reference to Ivan Krylov's fable of the same name, which describes a cuckoo and a cock singing each other's praises. p. 341

[428] A reference to the trip by a leader of the German Social-Democratic Party, the rabid social-chauvinist A. Südekum, to Italy, on assignment from the Party's Executive. A record of his talk with the Italian socialists was printed in *Avanti!*, and then reprinted in various socialist newspapers. In Russian, it appeared in the Menshevik *Nasha Zarya* Nos. 7-8-9 for 1914. p. 341

[429] A reference to the conference of Left-wing Social-Democrats held on Lenin's initiative during the Copenhagen Congress. In his plan for the pamphlet *The European War and European Socialism*, Lenin gives a list of those who attended: Jules Guesde and Charles Rappoport from France; Louis de Brouckère from Belgium; Rosa Luxemburg and Emanuel Wurm from Germany; Julian Marchlewski (Karski) from Poland; Pablo Iglesias from Spain; Adolf Braun from Austria; Lenin, Plekhanov and others from Russia (see *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 22). p. 341

[430] The resolution "The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War", adopted on Lenin's report on the attitude to the war made at a Bolshevik conference in Berne on September 6, 1914. It is known as "Theses on War", and was the first document to define the attitude of the Bolshevik Party and international revolutionary Social-Democracy to the imperialist world war.

Lenin's theses were discussed in detail and adopted at the resolution of the conference. Signed "Group of Social-Democrats, Members of the R.S.D.L.P.", they were circulated to various Bolshevik sections abroad. For reasons of secrecy, Lenin made the following inscription on a copy in Krupskaya's hand: "Copy of the manifesto issued in Denmark". p. 341

[431] Charles Philips Trevelyan, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Education, said in an open letter to his electors that in the imperialist war the interests of one's nation were paramount and that these interests demanded peace. p. 342

[432] No. 254 of *Frankfurter Zeitung* on September 13, 1914, carried an article by Frank Oppenheimer, "Neue Rom und neue Karfageno" (The New Rome and the New Carthage). Lenin's extracts from the article are in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 85.

Frankfurter Zeitung—a daily, organ of big German stockbrokers, published in Frankfort on the Main from 1856 to 1943; resumed publication in 1949 under the name *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*; a mouthpiece of the West-German monopolists. p. 342

[433] *Russkoye Znamya* (Russian Banner)—a Black-Hundred newspaper, organ of the Union of the Russian People, published in St. Petersburg from 1905 to 1917.

Here Lenin refers to an editorial in its No. 105 of August 30, 1914, which spoke of the leaflets of the St. Petersburg Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. p. 342

[434] A reference to Karl Kautsky's article "Prospects for Peace", extracts from which were published in *Golos* Nos. 18 and 19 on October 2 and 3, 1914. p. 342

[435] A reference to an item "W. C. Modell 70" carried in No. 227 of *Vorwärts* on August 21, 1914. p. 342

[436] A possible reference to the 42-cm. guns made in Germany by Krupp and first used in the war of 1914-18. p. 343

[437] *Kreuz-Zeitung*—a popular name for an ultra-reactionary German daily, *Neue Preussische Zeitung*, which had a cross on its masthead. The paper was the organ of German conservatives and was published in Berlin from 1848 to 1939. From 1911 on it was called *Neue Preussische* (*Kreuz*) *Zeitung*, and from 1932—*Kreuz-Zeitung*. p. 343

[438] A reference to "Press Review" in No. 14 of *Golos* on September 27, 1914, which commented on the stand of the English socialists and gave extracts from articles by Keir Hardie and MacDonald. It said that MacDonald "revealed too much pessimism in assessing the consequences of the current war". p. 343

[439] A reference to the article "Silence, Eunuchs!" published as an editorial in No. 21 of *Golos* on October 6, 1914, which said that the German Social-Democrats would have compromised themselves if, in the conditions of Germany pressed by the Russian troops, they were to "issue a call for a revolutionary Commune", and that this would have isolated them from the broad masses. p. 344

[440] A reference to the appeal "From Writers, Artists and Actors" written in the spirit of bourgeois patriotism and justification of tsarist Russia's war against Germany. It was signed by the honorary Academicians and well-known artists A. Vasnetsov, V. Vasnetsov and K. Korovin, the sculptor S. Merkurov, F. Chaliapin and other prominent actors of Moscow theatres, the writers Maxim Gorky A. Serafimovich, Skitalets and others, the editors of magazines P. Struve, N. Mikhailov, D. Tikhomirov, etc.

The appeal was published in No. 223 of *Russkoye Slovo* on September 28 (October 11), 1914. p. 344

[441] *Dzvin* (The Bell)—a legal nationalist monthly of Menshevik make-up, published in Ukrainian in Kiev from January 1913 to mid-1914. There were 18 issues. Among those who took part in the magazine were V. Vinnichenko, L. Yurkevich (Rybalka), S. Petlyura G. Alexinsky, P. Axelrod and L. Trotsky. The magazine ceased publication at the beginning of the First World War.

The article "The Ukraine and the War" was written by V. Levinsky. p. 345

[442] *Alliance for the Liberation of the Ukraine*—a bourgeois nationalist organisation set up by a group of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists in 1914, after the start of the First World War. Expecting the defeat of tsarist Russia in the war, the alliance set itself the task of securing Ukraine's secession from Russia and establishing a bourgeois and landowner autocratic Ukrainian state under the German protectorate. p. 345

[443] The item was raised at the conference of the R.S.D.L.P. sections abroad, at Berne, in connection with the attempt on the part of some R.S.D.L.P. organisations abroad (the Baugy group, the Paris section) to start publication of local newspapers separately from the Central Organ. In the conditions of wartime and in view of the great scarcity of funds and literary forces, the need for closer contacts between Bolsheviks and joint discussion of important questions, Lenin considered it inappropriate to publish small local papers, and motioned an amendment to point 3 of the draft resolution on the question, which was put up for debate at the conference. Lenin's motion was carried and the conference adopted point 3 in his wording (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh...*, Part I, p. 331). p. 346

[444] *The International Socialist Women's Conference* was held at Berne from March 26 to 28, 1915. It was called on the initiative of the magazine *Rabotnitsa*'s organisation abroad with the close participation of Clara Zetkin, who was at the time Chairman of the International Socialist Women's Bureau. All the preparatory work for the conference was carried out by I. F. Armand, N. K. Krupskaya and others under Lenin's direction. The conference was attended by 29 delegates from women's organisations of Britain, Germany Holland, France, Poland, Russia and Switzerland. The seven delegates from Russia included four from the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee (Armand, Krupskaya and others) and three from the O.C. Most of the delegates to the conference were under the influence of the Centrists, which is why instead of discussing general socialist tasks in connection with the war, the conference confined its work to discussing Clara Zetkin's report "On Socialist Women's International Action for Peace". The resolution on this question was worked out by Clara Zetkin with the participation of delegates from Britain and Holland and was of a Centrist character. The representatives of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee motioned a draft resolution written by Lenin, which indicated to the socialist women the revolutionary way of fighting against the war and international opportunism. Inessa Armand spoke for the draft at the conference, which however adopted the resolution drawn up by Clara Zetkin.

Lenin assessed the conference as an attempt to restore international ties and tried to use it for the purpose of rallying the internationalist elements on a revolutionary platform. But, as he pointed out later, this and other conferences of internationalists held at the time, while being inspired by the best intentions, did not lay down a militant internationalist line..., "they confined themselves

to repeating the old resolutions" and "at best were *marking time*" (see present edition, Vol. 21, p. 325).

The material on the International Socialist Women's Conference was published in a Supplement to *Sotsial-Demokrat* No. 42, on June 1, 1915. p. 346

[445] *The First International Socialist Conference at Zimmerwald* (Switzerland) was held from September 5 to 8, 1915.

It was attended by 38 delegates from 11 European countries. Most delegates took a Centrist stand. It discussed the following questions: 1) reports by representatives of the various countries; 2) joint declaration by representatives of Germany and France; 3) proposal by the Zimmerwald Left on the adoption of a resolution of principle; 4) adoption of a manifesto; 5) elections to the International Socialist Committee; 6) adoption of a resolution voicing sympathy for the victims of the war and the persecuted.

Lenin took an active part in the work of the Conference: he made speeches, sent notes to delegates during the sittings and spoke to them during the recesses. Before the Conference, he carried out extensive preparatory work in rallying the Left wing against the social-chauvinists and the Centrists. On the eve of the Zimmerwald Conference, between September 2 and 4, there was a meeting of Russian and Polish delegates to discuss a "Draft Resolution Proposed by the Left Wing at Zimmerwald" which was written by Lenin, and a draft resolution motioned by Karl Radek which Lenin had criticised before the meeting. After the discussion it was decided to motion at the Zimmerwald Conference Radek's draft corrected on the basis of Lenin's remarks. The draft resolution and the draft manifesto written by Lenin condemned social-chauvinism and Centrism, raised the question of rejecting the slogans: "defend your country" in the imperialist war and a "civil peace", and pointed to the need for the propaganda of revolutionary action.

A majority at the Conference rejected the draft resolution on the war and the tasks of Social-Democrats and the draft manifesto motioned by the Left wing. However, the appeal "To the Proletarians of Europe" adopted by the Conference contained, thanks to Lenin's insistence, a number of basic propositions of revolutionary Marxism.

Lenin's "Draft Resolution Proposed by the Left Wing at Zimmerwald", his articles "The First Step" and "Revolutionary Marxists at the International Socialist Conference of September 5-8, 1915", in which Lenin assesses the Zimmerwald Conference, are published in Vol. 21 of the present edition, pp. 345-48, 383-88, 389-93.

The proceeding of the Zimmerwald and the Kienthal conferences from which Lenin's speeches published in this volume have been taken, were received by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee from the International Institute of Social History at Amsterdam in 1964. Some minor remarks by Lenin are not included in the volume. p. 349

[446] These are theses for a report on the character of the First World War and the tactics of revolutionary internationalists, which Lenin gave at a private meeting of Left-wing Social-Democratic delegates at the Zimmerwald Conference on September 4, 1915, before the Conference opened. It was also attended by some other delegates. The meeting adopted the draft manifesto and the draft resolution motioned by the Left wing at the Zimmerwald Conference. p. 351

[447] A reference to the Vorkonferenz, a preliminary conference, on the question of convening an international socialist conference, held at Berne on July 11, 1915. It was called on the initiative of the Italian and Swiss socialists, and was attended by representatives of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee, the Regional Executive of the Polish Social-Democratic Party, the P.P.S.-Lewica and the O.C. of the Mensheviks. Most of those attending were Centrists. The main question was the composition of the forthcoming First International Socialist Conference. The Kautskian majority of the Vorkonferenz tried to get the Centrists led by Kautsky and even avowed social-chauvinists, Troelstra and Branting, to attend the conference. The representative of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee motioned a proposal that invitation to attend the next preliminary conference should be sent out to representatives of real Left-wingers in the international working-class movement, who had by then separated themselves from the official parties in most countries (the Dutch Left, the Bulgarian Tesnyaki, the Left-wing opposition in the Swedish and the Norwegian Social-Democratic parties, the group of German Left-wingers—International Socialists of Germany, the Polish Social-Democrats [opposition] and the Latvian Social-Democrats). But the Kautskian majority at the conference rejected the proposal. The preliminary conference adopted a decision to call the second Vorkonferenz which was to take the final decision on the conference. But it was not held, the Zimmerwald Conference being convened instead. p. 351

[448] In the discussion of the draft manifesto and the draft resolution on the war and the tasks of Social-Democrats, motioned on behalf of the Zimmerwald Left by Karl Radek, a sharp struggle flared up at the Conference between the revolutionary internationalists led by Lenin and the Kautskian majority led by the German Social-Democrat G. Ledebour. Opposing these documents, Ledebour and the Swiss Social-Democrat R. Grimm declared that, in putting forward concrete demands for revolutionary action, the draft manifesto and resolution motioned by the Left gave away the tactical measures of revolutionary Social-Democracy to the enemy. They said that people who signed these documents and spread their ideas in the belligerent countries could be subjected to reprisals. p. 353

[449] An apparent reference to the *Communist Manifesto* (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 21-65). p. 354

[450] *The Tribunists*—members of the Social-Democratic Party of Holland, whose organ was the newspaper *De Tribune*. Their leaders were D. Wijnkoop, H. Gorter, A. Pannekoek and Henriette Roland-Holst. They were not consistent revolutionaries but represented the Left wing of the labour movement in Holland, and during the First World War mainly took an internationalist stand. In 1918, they set up the Communist Party of Holland. p. 354

[451] A reference to Karl Liebknecht's letter of September 2, 1915, to the International Socialist Conference at Zimmerwald. He could not take part in the Conference, because he had been drafted into the German army in early 1915. In his letter he opposed "civil peace" and called for a civil war against the bourgeoisie, for the international solidarity of socialists of all the belligerent countries, for a struggle against the imperialist war and a break with the social-chauvinists. p. 354

[452] In his speech, the Italian Socialist Party delegate G. Serrati declared that the resolution on the war and the tasks of Social-Democrats, motioned by the Left, was either premature or belated, because the war was already on and it had been impossible to prevent its outbreak. p. 354

[453] The addenda were not included in the final text of the statement read out at the Conference in which the Zimmerwald Left motivated its voting for the official manifesto. p. 355

[454] This is apparently the beginning of an unfinished article. p. 355

[455] Lenin gave a lecture on the subject of "Two Internationals" in Zurich on February 4 (17), 1916. He gave the same lecture under a slightly changed name, "Two Trends in the International Working-Class Movement", in Lausanne between May 19 and 21 (June 1 and 3) and in Geneva on May 20 (June 2).

The manuscript of the plan for the lecture, which is at the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee, also reflects Lenin's preparation for the second lecture in Lausanne and Geneva. In connection with the new data available after the Second International Socialist Conference at Kienthal, Lenin made additions, crossed out some points and changed their numeration. All the changes made by Lenin in the plan are indicated in the footnotes. p. 359

[456] A reference to the report by Henriette Roland-Holst in "Beilage zur *Berner Tagwacht*" (Supplement to the *Berne Sentinel*) No. 18 of January 22, 1916, concerning the speech by the Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau, C. Huysmans, at the Extraordinary Congress of the Social-Democratic Party of Holland on January 8-9; Huysmans also spoke at Rotterdam on February 2. He was opposed by the Left internationalist D. Wijnkoop, who said that since Huysmans had voted for the war credits, socialists could no longer regard him as Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau. "We shall set up another International," said Wijnkoop.

At the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee there is a cutting from "Beilage zur *Berner Tagwacht*" No. 18 of January 22, 1916, with Lenin's markings; on Huysmans's speech at Rotterdam, Lenin made an extract from *L'Humanité* of February 9, 1916. Both documents were published in 1931 in *Lenin Miscellany XVII*.

Berner Tagwacht (Berne Sentinel)—an organ of the Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland, published in Berne since 1893. From 1909 to 1918, it was edited by R. Grimm. At the beginning of the First World War, it carried articles by K. Liebknecht, F. Mehring and other Left-wing Social-Democrats. From 1917 on, the newspaper openly supported the social-chauvinists. At the present time, the paper takes the same stand on the main domestic and foreign policy issues as the bourgeois press. p. 358

[457] A reference to the editorial article in No. 43 of *Avanti!* of February 12, 1916, "Intorno all'organizzazione socialista internazionale" (Around the Socialist International). The Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee has Lenin's extracts from this article with his remarks.

Avanti! (Forward!)— a daily, the Central Organ of the Italian Socialist Party, founded in Rome in December 1896. During the First World War, the paper took an inconsistent internationalist stand without breaking up with the reformists. In 1926, it was closed down by Mussolini's fascist government, but continued irregular publications abroad; resumed publication in Italy in 1943. p. 358

[458] A possible reference to reports from Paris about the Congress of the French Socialist Party of December 25-29, 1915, published in No. 52 of *The Labour Leader* on December 30, 1915, and in Nos. 2 and 4 on January 13 and 27, 1916.

The Labour Leader—a weekly published since 1891. From 1893, organ of the Independent Labour Party of Britain. From 1922, it was published under the name of *New Leader*; and since 1946, carries the name of *Socialist Leader*. p. 359

[459] *The Labour Party* of Britain was founded in 1900 as an association of trade unions, socialist organisations and groups to seat labour representatives in Parliament (the Labour Representation Committee). In 1906, the Committee took the name of Labour Party. Trade union members are automatically members of the Labour Party provided they pay party dues. The Labour Party is headed by an Executive Committee which together with the General Trades Union Council and the Executive of the Co-operative Party makes up the National Labour Council. Closely allied to the Labour Party are the Co-operative Party, which is a collective member, and the Independent Labour Party.

The Labour Party, which was initially a party of workers (many members of the petty bourgeoisie joined the party later), is opportunist in ideology and tactics. During the First World War its leaders took a social-chauvinist stand.

The Labourites have repeatedly formed governments (1924, 1929, 1945 and 1950), which conducted the policy of British imperialism. The dissatisfaction of the British working people with the reactionary policy of the Labour Party leadership has resulted in the formation of a Left-wing trend in the party aimed against the official policy of its leadership. p. 358

[460] *Forward*—a newspaper published in Glasgow since 1906. During the First World War it supported the policy of the Independent Labour Party of Britain. It was banned by the authorities after it carried a report on the so-called 1915 "Christmas events" in Glasgow (the centre on the Clyde area and of the shop stewards' movement), when Lloyd George, at the time Minister of Munitions, was shouted down by workers, who then staged an impressive demonstration in the heart of the city carrying anti-war and anti-government slogans.

They threatened to strike and the ban on the paper was lifted. p. 359

[461] *Merthyr*—a district in Southern Wales. Lenin apparently refers to the by-elections in the district, when the representative of the British Socialist Party mustered the votes of the Liberals and the Conservatives against the candidate of the Independent Labour Party. No. 46 of *The Labour Leader* of November 18, 1915, carried a report on the electoral struggle in Merthyr. p. 359

[462] An apparent reference to the newspaper *The Socialist* the official organ of the Socialist Labour Party of Britain, published in Glasgow in 1904, 1909-10, 1916, 1918-23. p. 359

[463] *Nashe Slovo* (Our Word)—a Menshevik-Trotskyite newspaper published in Paris from January 1915 to September 1916, in place of *Golos*. p. 359

[464] A possible reference to the report in the form of an appeal, "Die Internationalen in Oesterreich an die Internationalen aller Länder" (The Internationalists of Austria to the Internationalists of All Countries), carried in "Beilage zur *Berner Tagwacht*" Nos. 283 and 284 on December 3 and 4, 1915. p. 361

[465] A reference to Eugene Debs's articles "When I Shall Fight", "'Preparedness' I Favour", "The Only War I Will Fight in" and "Never Be a Soldier", published in the newspaper *Appeal to Reason* on August 25, September 11, December 11 and 25, 1915 (Nos. 1032, 1045 and 1047).

Cuttings from *Appeal to Reason* with Lenin's markings are at the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee. p. 361

[466] *Nashe Dyelo* (Our Cause)—a Menshevik liquidator monthly first published in January 1915 in place of *Nasha Zarya*, which was closed down in October 1914. *Nashe Dyelo* was the main organ of the social-chauvinists in Russia, and had contributions from Y. Mayevsky, P. P. Maslov, A. N. Potresov and N. Cherevanin, among others. There were six issues. p. 360

[467] *Nash Golos* (Our Voice)—a legal Menshevik newspaper published in Samara in 1915-16; it took a social-chauvinist stand. p. 360

[468] *Rabocheye Utro* (The Workers' Morning)—a legal Menshevik paper published in Petrograd from October to December 1915 in succession to *Utro* which appeared in August 1915. The newspaper used internationalist phrases to cover up its social-chauvinism and defencism. p. 360

[469] "*Khvostov labour party*"—named after A. N. Khvostov, Minister for the Interior and Chief of the special gendarme corps in 1915 and 1916. In the manuscript Lenin wrote the word "Stolypin" over the word "Khvostov". p. 361

[470] "*Europa und die Revolution*" (Europe and Revolution)—the title of an editorial item carried in No. 35 of *Volksrecht* on February 11, 1916, in connection with an article signed I. S. in the Lucerne chauvinist newspaper *Vaterland*, whose author said that the continuation of the war could cause revolution which was more dangerous "for the throne and the altar" than the war itself. An extract made by Lenin from *Volksrecht* with his remarks is at the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee. p. 361

[471] Lenin is comparing the voting against the war credits by the 20 Social-Democratic deputies of the German Reichstag on December 21, 1915, and the voting on March 20, 1915, when only two (Karl Liebknecht and Otto Rühle) voted against the war credits. The voting of 20 deputies against the war credits testified to growing pressure from the masses on the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany and its Reichstag group. However, the majority of the C.C. (Vorstand) and of the Reichstag group censured the December 21 vote as a breach of party discipline.

Speaking of the inconsistency of the 20, Lenin is referring to a statement made by F. Geyer on behalf of the members of the Social-Democratic group who had voted against the war credits on December 21, which gave no characteristic of the war as imperialist, made no mention of proletarian internationalism, and assumed that German plans of conquest were of a very recent development. p. 360

[472] *Lichtstrahlen* (Rays of Light)—a monthly, organ of the group of Left-wing Social-Democrats of Germany (Internationale Sozialisten Deutschlands), published under the editorship of J. Borchardt. It was published in Berlin with interruptions from 1913 to 1921. Among those who took part in the magazine were A. Pannekoek and A. Balabanova. p. 362

[473] No. 11 of *Vorwärts* of January 12, 1916, carried a statement by Otto Rühle, "Zur Parteispaltung" (On the Party Split), in which he said a split in the Social-Democratic Party of Germany was inevitable. The editors of *Vorwärts* said in the editorial that although the article was being published verbatim, they believed

that the controversial questions raised in it were not only premature, but altogether irrelevant. p. 362

[474] A reference to the May Day demonstration and a strike by the young workers of Brunswick in early May 1916. The strike was staged in protest against the government's deduction of part of the young workers' wages for a war loan. More than 1,500 men took part in the strike and the demonstration. Following a stubborn struggle, the government was forced to rescind its order on deductions on May 5, 1916. p. 363

[475] A reference to E. Vaillant's editorial article "Formalistes doctrinaires" (Doctrinaire Formalists) in *L'Humanité* No. 3827 on October 9, 1914, in which Vaillant, who went over to social-chauvinist positions at the very beginning of the war, was forced to admit that he was receiving letters from French socialists protesting against the policy of the French Socialist Party leadership. Lenin's extracts from Vaillant's article are in *Lenin Miscellany XIV*, p. 97. p. 362

[476] A reference to the appeal "To the Women of the Proletariat", signed by Louise Saumoneau on behalf of the French Socialist Women's Action Committee calling for the struggle for peace and against chauvinism. A copy of the appeal with Lenin's markings is at the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee. p. 363

[477] *The New Statesman*—a weekly of the Fabian Society, founded in London in 1913. Since 1931, it has been published under the name of *The New Statesman and Nation*. At present, it expresses the views of the Labour Party's Left wing. p. 362

[478] A possible reference to the approval of the Zimmerwald Manifesto by the Executive Committee of the British Socialist Party. At the end of 1915, it decided to poll local organisations about adhering to Zimmerwald; an overwhelming majority of local party organisations came out in favour of adherence. A report on the poll was published in the I.S.C. *Bulletin* No. 3 of February 29, 1916. p. 362

[479] A reference to the walk-out of H. Hyndman and his supporters from the annual conference of the British Socialist Party held at Salford on April 23 and 24, 1916. The conference marked the break-away of the British Socialist Party from the social-chauvinists. The conference adopted a number of anti-war resolutions of a general democratic character and a resolution urging the use of the party's full influence to put an end to the war. By an overwhelming majority, the conference adopted a resolution saying that the socialists recognise only a class war. In early June 1916, Hyndman set up the National Socialist Party which in 1918 took the name of the Social-Democratic Federation. p. 363

[480] A reference to the speech of C. Trèves in the Italian Chamber of Deputies on December 2, 1915. A report on the speech was published in *Avant!* No. 335 on December 3, 1915. p. 362

[481] *Tesnyaki*—a revolutionary trend in the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Party, which took shape in 1903 as an independent Bulgarian Social-Democratic Labour Party. The founder and leader of the Tesnyaki was D. Blagoev. He was succeeded by his followers G. Dimitrov, V. Kolarov and others. From 1914 to 1918, the Tesnyaki opposed the imperialist war. In 1919, they joined the Communist International and set up the Communist Party of Bulgaria. p. 362

[482] *Tribune*, *De Tribune*—a newspaper founded in 1907 by the Left wing of the Dutch Social-Democratic Labour Party. In 1909, following the expulsion of the Left-wingers from the party and their establishment of the Social-Democratic Party of Holland, it became the organ of the latter. From 1918, it was the organ of the Dutch Communist Party, published under the name until 1937. p. 362

[483] A possible reference to the items by E. Pernerstorfer, "Russland und wir" (Russia and We) and "Nochmals Russland und wir" (Once again Russia and We), published in Nos. 13 and 20 of *Die Neue Zeit* on December 24, 1915, and February 11, 1916. p. 364

[484] A reference to the article "Die Stellung der Sozialdemokraten Australiens zum Krieg" (The Attitude of Australian Social-Democrats to the War) published under the initials J. K. in "Beilage zur *Berner Tagwacht*" Nos. 32 and 34 of February 8 and 10, 1916. p. 364

[485] "*I.K.*", "*Internationale Korrespondenz*" (International Correspondence)—a weekly of the German social-chauvinists dealing with international affairs and the labour movement. It was published in Berlin from the end of September 1914 to October 1, 1918. An apparent reference to the article "Hughes und die australischen Gewerksschaften" (Hughes and the Australian Trade Unions) published in *Internationale Korrespondenz* No. 15 on May 23, 1916. A copy of this magazine with Lenin's markings on the article is at the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee. p. 364

[486] *Appeal to Reason*—the newspaper of the American socialists, founded at Girard, Kansas, in 1895. It was not officially connected with the Socialist Party of America, but conducted propaganda of socialist ideas and was very popular among the workers. The paper had contributions from the American Socialist Eugene Debs. p. 364

[487] *Kommunist* was organised by Lenin and was published by the Editorial Board of *Sotsial-Demokrat* together with G. L. Pyatakov and Yevgenia Bosh, who financed the publication. N. I. Bukharin was also on the Editorial Board. One (double) issue was published. It carried, apart from the article "The Voice of an Honest French Socialist", two other articles by Lenin: "The Collapse of the Second International" and "Imperialism and Socialism in Italy".

The plan for the publication of the journal was worked out by Lenin in the spring of 1915. He directed the organisational meeting of the Editorial Board. Lenin hoped to make it an international organ of Left-wing Social-Democrats. However, there soon appeared serious differences between the Editorial Board and Bukharin, Pyatakov and Bosh, which were aggravated after the issue of No. 1-2. The Bukharin-Pyatakov-Bosh group took an incorrect attitude on many basic questions of the Programme and tactics of the Party—the right of nations to self-determination, the role of democratic demands and the minimum programme in general, etc.—and tried to use the journal for their factional aims. On the Editorial Board, Lenin conducted a struggle against the Bukharin-Pyatakov-Bosh group, exposing their anti-Bolshevik views and factional acts, and sharply criticising the conciliatory attitude of G. Y. Zinoviev and A. G. Shlyapnikov towards the group.

In view of the anti-Party behaviour of this group, the Editorial Board of *Sotsial-Demokrat*, on Lenin's proposal, declared that it considered the further publication of the journal impossible. The C.C. Bureau in Russia, having heard a report on the differences on the *Kommunist* Editorial Board, declared its full solidarity with the Editorial Board of the Central Organ, *Sotsial-Demokrat*, and expressed the wish that "all C.C. publications should be edited in a strictly consistent tenor, in full conformity with the line of the C.C., which it had adopted at the beginning of the war". p. 367

[488] The following text is an addition to the draft resolution, addressed to G. Y. Zinoviev. p. 367

[489] *Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata* (*Sotsial-Demokrat* Collection) was founded by Lenin and published by the Editorial Board of the newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat*. There were two issues: No. 1 in October and No. 2 in December 1916. Material was prepared for No. 3 which was to include Lenin's article "A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism", but the publication was discontinued for lack of funds. p. 368

[490] The name given to G. Pyatakov and Yevgenia Bosh because they had emigrated from Russia to Switzerland via Japan. p. 368

[491] *The Second International Socialist Conference* was held at Kienthal, Switzerland, from April 24 to 30, 1916. It was attended by 43 delegates from 10 countries and discussed the following questions: 1) the struggle to end the war; 2) attitude of the proletariat to questions of peace; 3) agitation and propaganda; 4) parliamentary activity; 5) mass struggle, and 6) convocation of the International Socialist Bureau.

As a result of the work done by Lenin and the Bolsheviks before the Conference, the Left wing at the Conference was stronger than at Zimmerwald. The Zimmerwald Left worked out and motioned at the Conference a draft resolution on peace, which contained Lenin's basic propositions. Although the Kienthal Conference failed to adopt the Bolshevik slogans—to transform the imperial-

ist war into a civil war, to work for the defeat in the war of one's own imperialist government and to set up the Third International—it nevertheless helped to bring out and rally the internationalist elements. Lenin said the Kienthal Conference was a step forward.

Lenin wrote: "Draft Resolution on the Convocation of the Second Socialist Conference", "For the Conference To Be Held on April 24, 1916. Proposal of the Delegation" and "Proposals Submitted by the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. to the Second Socialist Conference" (see present edition, Vol. 22, pp. 121, 122, 169-79). p. 369

[492] *The International Socialist Commission* (*I.S.C.*) in Berne—the executive organ of the Zimmerwald association, set up by the Zimmerwald Conference held on September 5-8, 1915. The I.S.C. included the Centrists R. Grimm, O. Morgari, Ch. Naine, and A. Balabanova as interpreter. The official report of the Conference published in the I.S.C. *Bulletin* No. 1 of September 21, 1915, said: "This secretariat should in no sense substitute for the now existing International Socialist Bureau, and should be dissolved as soon as the latter can fully answer its purpose." On a copy of the report, now at the Central Party Archives, Lenin underlined these words and wrote in the margin: "Kein Beschluss darüber" (There was no decision about this), that is, the decision was adopted not by the Zimmerwald association, but after the Conference. p. 369

[493] *The London conference of the socialists of the Triple Entente countries* was held on February 14, 1915. It was attended by representatives of the social-chauvinists and pacifist groups of Britain, France, Belgium and Russia: the Independent Labour Party, the British Socialist Party, the Labour Party, the Fabian Society, the French Socialist Party, the General Confederation of Labour, the Belgian Socialist Party, the S.R.s and the Mensheviks. On its agenda were these questions: 1) the rights of nations; 2) colonies; 3) guarantees for a future peace.

The Bolsheviks were not invited to the conference. However on Lenin's instructions, M. M. Litvinov went to the conference to read out a declaration of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee. It was based on a draft written by Lenin. The declaration contained a demand for the withdrawal of the socialists from the bourgeois governments, a complete break with the imperialists a repudiation of collaboration with them, resolute struggle against the imperialist governments and condemnation of the voting of war credits. As he was reading out the declaration, Litvinov was interrupted and not allowed to continue. He handed in the text of the declaration to the presidium and left the conference. On the London conference see Lenin's articles "The London Conference" and "On the London Conference" (present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 132-34, 178-80). p. 371

[494] A reference to the conference of socialists from Germany and Austria held in Vienna in April 1915. It was a sort of response to the London conference of the socialists of the Triple Entente countries. Its

resolution endorsed the social-chauvinist "defend your country" slogan in the imperialist war. p. 371

[495] *Possibilists*—a petty-bourgeois reformist trend in the French socialist movement. Their idea was that the workers should confine their struggle to the "possible". p. 372

[496] *The circular*—the appeal "To All Affiliated Parties and Groups"—was adopted unanimously at the meeting of the enlarged I.S.C. held at Berne from February 5 to 9, 1916. The delegation of the R.S.D.L.P. C.C., led by Lenin, entered a statement saying that the appeal was a step forward from the decisions of the First International Socialist Conference at Zimmerwald, but that it did not find it satisfactory on every point. The appeal was published in No. 3 of the I.S.C. *Bulletin* on February 29, 1916, and in No. 52 of *Sozial-Demokrat* on March 25, 1916. p. 375

[497] The question of attitude to convening the International Socialist Bureau was the subject of acute polemics at the Kienthal Conference on April 27 and 28, 1916. The Kautskian section of the Conferencs motioned several draft resolutions containing the common demand for recognising the need to call the I.S.B. Supporters of the Zimmerwald Left, headed by Lenin, opposed the idea. Under the pressure of the Left, the Right-wing delegates had to support the draft compromise resolution worked out by the committee. The resolution sharply criticised the I.S.B. and demanded the replacement of the Executive Committee of the I.S.B. and expulsion of the socialist ministers from their parties. However, it did not urge an immediate break with the I.S.B. or the establishment of a new International, but, on the contrary, authorised the national sections within the Zimmerwald association to demand the convocation of the I.S.B. p. 379

[498] The joint conference of Italian and Swiss socialists held at Lugano (Switzerland) on September 27, 1914. This was the first wartime effort to restore international ties. p. 379

[499] In his speech, L. Martov proposed that the draft resolutions on convening the I.S.B. should be referred to the committee to work out a compromise resolution. p. 380

[500] This was a protest against the oppressive policy of the tsarist autocracy, and the German and the Austrian governments, who, "depriving the Polish people of the possibility of deciding its own future, regard the Polish regions as a pledge in the forthcoming game of compensations...." "This is an especially gross expression of the essence of the policy of the capitalist governments, who, while sending masses of people into the slaughter, arbitrarily determine the future of the peoples for whole generations." The Polish Social-Democrats expressed the conviction that only the participation in the imminent struggle of the revolutionary international proletariat for socialism, "a struggle that would break the chains of national oppression and abolish all forms of alien domination, will assure the Polish people as well the possibi-

lity of an all-round development as an equal member of the union of nations".

The document published here was written by Lenin on a separate sheet and is apparently a variant of the corresponding passage from his article "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up" (see present edition, Vol. 22, p. 348). p. 380

[501] The plan was drawn up not earlier than November 18 (December 1), 1916, when Lenin was working on the material concerning the Marxist attitude to the state. The sheet containing the plan was inserted in the notebook "Marxism on the State". That Lenin intended to write a work on the state is evident from his note "The Youth International" published in December 1916. Analysing and criticising N. I. Bukharin's article "The Imperialist Predatory State", Lenin wrote: "We hope to return to this very important subject in a separate article" (see present edition, Vol. 23, p. 166). A comparison of the present plan with Bukharin's articles "Concerning the Theory of the Imperialist State" and "The Imperialist Predatory State" shows that this is precisely the plan for an article aimed against Bukharin's anti-Marxist, semi-anarchist views of the state.

In a letter to A. M. Kollontai on February 4 (17), 1917, Lenin wrote: "I am preparing (have got the material ready) an article on the question of the attitude of Marxism to the state" (see present edition, Vol. 35, p. 286). The article was intended for No. 4 of *Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata*, but was apparently not written. The material collected by Lenin for the article made up his notebook, "Marxism on the State" (see Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 123-307) and was used by Lenin in his book *The State and Revolution* (see present edition, Vol. 25, pp. 385-497). p. 381

[502] See Marx, "Critical Remarks on 'Prussian's' Article, 'The King of Prussia and Social Reform'". Lenin quotes the article from the book *Aus dem literarischen Nachlaß, von K. Marx, F. Engels und F. Lassalle*. Hrsg. von F. Mehring. Bd. 2. Gesammelte Schriften von K. Marx und F. Engels. Von Juli 1844 bis November 1847. Stuttgart, 1902. p. 382

[503] Engels, "On Authority" (see Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1962, pp. 636-39). p. 382

[504] See Marx, "Der politischen Indifferentismus" (Political Indifferentism) (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd, 18, S. 299-304, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1962). p. 382

[505] *The Social-Democratic Party of Switzerland* (in French and Italian cantons the party is called the Swiss Socialist Party) was set up in the 1870s and was a member of the First International. It was re-established in 1888. Strong influence in the party was enjoyed by the opportunists, who in the First World War took a social-chauvinist stand. In the autumn of 1916, the Right wing split away from the Party and set up its own organisation. The party majority headed by B. Grimm took a Centrist, social-pacifist

stand. The Left wing of the party took an internationalist stand. Under the influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, the Left wing of the party gained in strength. In December 1920, the Left withdrew from the party and in 1921 united with the Communist Party of Switzerland (now the Swiss Party of Labour), which was formed in 1919. p. 382

[506] *The Spartacus group*—a revolutionary organisation of German Left-wing Social-Democrats, formed at the beginning of the First World War by Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring, Clara Zetkin, J. Marchlewski, L. Jogiches (Tyszka) and W. Pieck. In April 1915 Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring founded the magazine *Die Internationale*, which rallied the main forces of German Left-wing Social-Democrats. On January 1, 1916, an All-German Conference of Left-wing Social-Democrats was held in Berlin where the group was formalised and decided to call itself the *Internationale* group. As its platform, the conference adopted "Leitsätze" (Basic Propositions) worked out by Rosa Luxemburg with the participation of Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring and Clara Zetkin. In 1916, the *Internationale* group, apart from political leaflets which it published from 1915, began illegal publication and circulation of "Political Letters" signed Spartacus (published regularly until October 1918); then it also began to call itself the Spartacus group.

The Spartacists conducted revolutionary propaganda in the masses, organised mass anti-war manifestations, directed strikes and exposed the imperialist character of the world war and the betrayal of the opportunist Social-Democratic leaders. However they made serious mistakes in theory and policy: they denied the possibility of national liberation wars in the epoch of imperialism failed to take a consistent stand on the slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war, underestimated the role of the proletarian party as the vanguard of the working class and feared a resolute break with the opportunists.

In April 1917, the group joined the Centrist Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany, retaining its organisational independence. In November 1918, during the revolution in Germany, the Spartacus group broke away from the "Independents" and set up the Spartacus Union, publishing its own programme on December 14, 1918. At their inaugural congress (December 30, 1918-January 1, 1919) they set up the Communist Party of Germany. Lenin repeatedly criticised the mistakes of the German Left-wing Social-Democrats and pointed to the inconsistency of their stand. At the same time, he put a high value on their revolutionary activity. He wrote: "The work of the German Spartacus group, which has carried on systematic revolutionary propaganda in the most difficult conditions, has really saved the honour of German socialism and the German proletariat" (see present edition, Vol. 35, p. 369). p. 383

[507] These are Lenin's remarks to an article by G. Y. Zinoviev on maximalism intended for publication in the journal *Kommunist* or the

newspaper *Sotsial-Demokrat*. The article did not appear in the press. p. 384

[508] *Dyelo* (The Cause)—a fortnightly Menshevik journal, published in Moscow from August 1916 to January 1917 under the editorship of A. N. Potresov, P. P. Maslov and L. I. Axelrod (Orthodox). In 1916, there were ten issues (three of them double issues), and in 1917—one. The journal took a chauvinist attitude. p. 384

[509] *Three pillars*—the accepted designation in the legal Bolshevik press and at open, legal meetings of the three basic ("uncurtailed") revolutionary slogans: democratic republic, 8-hour working day and confiscation of all landed estates. p. 386

[510] A reference to R. Hilferding's book *Finance Capital. The Recent Phase in the Development of Capitalism*. Authorised translation from the German by I. Stepanov, Moscow, 1912. p. 388

[511] Joseph Patouillet, *L'impérialiste américain* (American Imperialism), Dijon, 1904. Junius—Rosa Luxemburg's pseudonym; her book *Die Krise der Sozialdemokratie* (Crisis of Social-Democracy) was published in 1916. For Lenin's extracts from this work see present edition, Vol. 39, pp. 209-12. p. 388

[512] A reference to two articles of the German chauvinist Paul Lensch, carried in the magazine *Die Glocke* (The Bell): "Die Selbstbestimmungsflause" (Bragging about Self-Determination) in No. 8, 1915, and "Sozialismus und Annexionen in der Vergangenheit" (Socialism and Annexations in the Past) in No. 9, 1916. Lenin's extracts from these articles are in *Lenin Miscellany XXX*, pp. 118-27. p. 388

[513] An apparent reference to the following five articles by Kautsky: 1) "Sozialdemokratische Anschauungen über den Krieg vor dem jetzigen Krieg" (Social-Democratic Views on War Before the Present War)—*Die Neue Zeit* No. 13, December 29, 1916; 2) "Neue Sozialdemokratischen Auffassungen vom Krieg" (New Social-Democratic View on War)—*Die Neue Zeit* No. 14, January 5, 1917; 3) "Friedensbedingungen" (Terms of Peace—*Leipziger Volkszeitung*, December 13, 1916; 4) "Die Aufnahme des Friedensangebots" (Acceptance of Peace Proposal)—*Leipziger Volkszeitung*, December 21, 1916; 5) "Der Heiland der Welt" (Saviour of the World)—*Leipziger Volkszeitung* No. 289, December 24, 1916. p. 389

[514] *Neue Beiträge zur Biographie von Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels* (New Material for a Biography of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels) published by Franz Mehring in *Die Neue Zeit*, XXV. Jahrgang, 11. Bd. 1907. p. 389

[515] This was written in connection with an article by R. Grimm, "The Majority and the Minority on the War Question", in *Berner Tagwacht* Nos. 19-23 of January 23-27 and in the magazine *Neues Leben* in January 1917, which defended the Centrist attitude of the majority of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party. p. 391

[516] The article was not written. Many propositions formulated in the plan were elaborated by Lenin in his "Letters from Afar" (see present edition, Vol. 23, pp. 295-342). p. 393

[517] This deals with the question of reworking the Party Programme. Lenin first intended to devote the fourth and then the fifth letter to this subject. But both the fourth and the unfinished fifth letter deal with other subjects. The manuscript of the plan included in this volume shows that Lenin subsequently added new points to it (2 bis, 5 bis and points marked with a +).

The plan became the basis for his work on the Party Programme upon his arrival in Russia (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 459-63, 466-79).

V. A. Karpinsky said the note in the margin was addressed to him. p. 394

[518] See Engels, "Zur Kritik des socialdemokratischen Programmentwurfes 1891" (Criticism of the Draft Social-Democratic Programme of 1891) (Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 22, S. 240-43, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1962). p. 395

[519] The book burnt by the tsarist censorship was Lenin's *The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution of 1905-1907*, which he wrote at the end of 1907 (see present edition, Vol. 13, pp. 217-431). In 1908 the book was printed in St. Petersburg, but was confiscated by the police at the printers' and destroyed. By 1917, only one copy remained. It was first published in 1917. p. 395

[520] *Politiken* (Politics)—a newspaper of the Swedish Left-wing Social-Democrats who in 1917 set up the Left Social-Democratic Party of Sweden; it was published in Stockholm from April 27, 1916. From November 1917, it was published under the name *Folkets Dagblad Politiken* (People's Political Daily). From 1916 to 1918 it was edited by Ture Nerman. Among its contributors were the Left Zimmerwaldists of Germany, Russia, France and other countries. In 1921, after the Left Social-Democratic Party joined the Comintern and took the name of Communist Party, the newspaper became its organ. Following a split in the Communist Party in October 1929, the paper passed into the hands of the Right wing. Its publication was discontinued in May 1945. p. 396

[521] *Socialdemokraten* (Social-Democrat)—organ of the Right, social-chauvinist wing of the Swedish Social-Democratic Party, led by K. H. Branting. p. 396

[522] The communiqué was handed by Lenin to the Editorial Board of the Swedish Left-wing Social-Democratic newspaper, *Politiken*, and through it to the representatives of the press and public, upon his arrival in Stockholm on March 31 (April 13). The newspapers *Rech* and *Den*, having received the text of the communiqué through the Petrograd telegraph agency, published it on April 5 (18) without the last paragraph which contained the testimony of

the representatives of international Social-Democracy concerning the organisation of the trip across Germany. p. 397

[523] *Nachalo* (The Beginning)—a newspaper published in Paris from September 1916 to March 1917 in place of *Nashe Slovo*. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917 the paper was published under the title *Novaya Epokha* (New Epoch). p. 397

[524] *Demain* (Tomorrow)—a literary, publicistic and political monthly founded by the French internationalist, writer and journalist H. Guilbeaux; it was published first in Geneva and then in Moscow from January 1916 to 1919 (with a break from January to April 1917). p. 398

[525] A reference to F. Loriot. p. 398

[526] The conference was held on the morning of March 31 (April 13) at the Regina Hotel in the presence of a group of Russian émigrés led by Lenin and Swedish Left-wing Social-Democrats C. Lindhagen, F. Ström, C. N. Carleson, K. Kilbom and Ture Nerman. The burgomaster of Stockholm C. Lindhagen and Lenin presided at the conference. C. Lindhagen spoke on the subject of "Light from the East"; Lenin gave a short report on the trip; a protocol on the circumstances of the trip across Germany was read out, after which the Swedish Social-Democrats expressed their readiness to testify their full solidarity with the step of the Russian revolutionaries. On behalf of the Swedes the conference was also addressed by C. N. Carleson, who expressed the hope that the revolution in Russia would grow into an international one. In conclusion, the Swedes gave an enthusiastic reception to the Russians and the organiser of the trip, Fritz Platten. p. 398

[527] The Bolshevik group of the Soviet discussed the attitude to the "liberty loan" for two days, April 10 and 11 (23 and 24), 1917. The draft resolution for the Plenary Meeting of the Soviet was worked out with Lenin's active participation. A resolution refusing support for the loan was motioned by the committee headed by A. M. Kollontai, after which Lenin and Zinoviev proposed a second resolution supplementing the first. The two resolutions were consolidated and were adopted unanimously on April 11 (24). The report of the group's sitting was published in *Pravda* No. 31 of April 13 (26).

In his report on the present situation at the April Conference, Lenin said that the question of war "actually united us when we came out against the loan" (present edition, Vol. 24, p. 232).

At the Soviet's Plenary Meeting, 2,000 deputies voted for the loan and 123 against. p. 399

[528] *The Petrograd City Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.*(*B.*) was called by decision of the St. Petersburg Committee of April 6 (19) and was held from April 14 to 22 (April 27-May 5), 1917. It was attended by 57 delegates, including delegates from the Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, Polish and Lithuanian organisations, representatives of the Military Organisation, and also two mezhraiontsi (see Note 556). On the agenda were the following questions: current

tasks—present situation; attitude to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the question of its reorganisation; structure of Party organisation; attitude to the other Social-Democratic trends; municipal elections; harassment of *Pravda*.

Lenin was elected honorary Chairman of the Conference. He gave the main political report on "Current Tasks—Present Situation", and was on the committee to work out the resolutions: "On the Attitude Towards the Provisional Government" and "On the War"; he motioned the resolutions "On the Municipal Elections" and "On the Attitude Towards the Parties of Socialist-Revolutionaries, Menshevik Social-Democrats, 'non-factional' Social-Democrats and other kindred political trends".

Kamenev's attempt in his speech and amendments to Lenin's resolution on the attitude to the Provisional Government to put through the demand of control over it, was exposed by Lenin as conciliatory, as the policy of Chkheidze and Steklov.

By an overwhelming majority, the Conference adopted Lenin's resolution on the attitude to the Provisional Government. At the first sitting it adopted Lenin's appeal "Against the Riot-mongers. To the Workers, Soldiers and the Whole Population of Petrograd."

On April 10 (May 2) the sittings were interrupted in view of the massive protest movement in response to the Provisional Government's note to the allied powers on April 18 (May 1) expressing its readiness to continue the imperialist war. The Conference decided to urge the workers and soldiers to give organised expression to their solidarity with the basic propositions of the Party Central Committee resolution of April 20 (May 3) on the crisis in connection with the said note of the Provisional Government (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 184-85). The delegates took part in explanatory work carried on by the Central Committee in the masses. In view of this, subsequent sittings were not fully attended.

The decisions of the Petrograd City Conference testified to the cohesion of the Petrograd Bolsheviks round Lenin's "April Theses"; Lenin's tactics were given approval by the Party organisation of the capital, the largest in the country. The resolutions of the Petrograd Conference largely formed the basis of the resolutions of the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 139-66). p. 400

[529] *Izvestia Petrogradskogo Sovieta Rabochikh i Soldatskikh Deputatov* (Bulletin of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies)—a daily; the first issue appeared on February 28 (March 13), 1917, under the title *Izvestia Petrogradskogo Sovieta Rabochikh Deputatov* (Bulletin of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' Deputies); from No. 3 of March 2 (15) the paper became the organ of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

With the formation, at the First All-Russia Congress of Soviets, of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the paper became its organ and from August 1 (14) (No. 132) was published under the name *Izvestia Tsentralnogo Ispolnitelnogo Komiteta i Petrogradskogo Sovieta Rabochikh i Soldatskikh Deputatov* (Bulletin of the Central Execu-

tive Committee and of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies). The paper's political line was determined by the representatives of the S.R.-Menshevik bloc who conducted the conciliatory policy of supporting the bourgeois Provisional Government and who opposed the revolutionary action of the proletariat.

After the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets, its Editorial Board was changed and the newspaper became the official organ of the Soviet Government. It carried the first important documents of the Soviet Government and Lenin's articles and speeches. In March 1918, its publication was transferred to Moscow.

After the formation of the U.S.S.R. in December 1922, the paper became the organ of the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. and the All-Russia Central Executive Committee. Under a decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on January 24, 1938, the paper was reorganised and since January 26, 1938, until the present day it has been published under the name of *Izvestia Sovietov Deputatov Trudyashchikhsya* (Bulletin of the Soviets of Working People's Deputies). p. 403

[530] A reference to J. Maclean. p. 403

[531] Arriving at a meeting of the soldiers' section of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies on April 17 (30), Lenin requested the floor to make an urgent statement over the publication in the newspapers on April 16 (29) of the resolution of the Executive Commission of the soldiers' section which condemned the "propaganda of the Leninists" as being just as harmful as "any other counter-revolutionary propaganda from the right" (see present edition, Vol. 24, p. 172). As he was speaking the Menshevik-S.R. majority, against the protests of the minority, got his time limited to 30 minutes. When Lenin finished speaking, he replied to questions from the meeting and then to those of the soldiers who surrounded him in a room at the exit of the Taurida Palace.

After Lenin's speech and objections to it from the Menshevik Lieber, the soldiers' section decided to proceed with its business, without making any statement on the substance of the question.

Lenin's speech was published in a distorted version in *Rech* and *Yedinstvo*. It is here published in accordance with the minutes now at the Central Party Archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee. p. 404

[532] A reference to the dispatch to the front of units from the Petrograd garrison, against which workers and soldiers protested, seeing this as the Provisional Government's attempt to weaken the revolutionary population of the capital and violate the condition put forward by the Executive Committee when the Provisional Government was formed on the night of March 1 (14), that the garrison units which had taken part in overthrowing the autocracy were not to be withdrawn from Petrograd. p. 405

[533] A reference to the work *Socialism and War* (see present edition, Vol. 21, pp. 295-338). p. 406

[534] *Russkaya Volya* (Russian Will)—a bourgeois daily founded by the tsarist Minister for the Interior, A. D. Protopopov, which was financed by the big banks; it was published in Petrograd from December 1916. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917, it carried on a slander campaign against the Bolsheviks. Lenin called it "one of the most infamous bourgeois newspapers" (see present edition, Vol. 25, p. 302). It was closed down by the Revolutionary Military Committee on October 25, 1917. p. 407

[535] Show-window villages erected for the benefit of Empress Catherine by her favourite Potemkin. p. 408

[536] *The Seventh* (*April*) *All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.*(*B.*) was called by decision of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) Central Committee, taken between April 4 and 8 (17 and 21), and was held in Petrograd from April 24 to 29 (May 7-12), 1917. It was the Party's first conference in legal conditions. It was attended by 131 delegates with vote and 18 with voice from 78 Party organisations (including Petrograd and its environments, Moscow and Moscow District, the Central Industrial Area, the Urals, the Donbas, the Volga area and the Caucasus) and also by representatives of front and rear military organisations, the national organisations of Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Finland and Estonia. On the strength of its representation and the political and organisational tasks it dealt with, the Conference could perform and did perform the work of a Party congress: it worked out the political line for the whole Party and set up the Party governing centres.

At 2 p.m. on the day before it opened, there was a meeting of more than a hundred delegates at which new items were added to the agenda and the standing orders of the Conference were approved. A report on the April 21-22 events was given by Lenin who was met with warm applause. On the agenda of the Conference were the following questions: the current situation (the war and the Provisional Government, etc.), a peace conference, attitude to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, revision of the Party Programme, the situation within the International and the Party's tasks; unification of the internationalist Social-Democratic organisations, agrarian question, national question, Constituent Assembly, organisational question, reports by regions and elections to the Central Committee.

Lenin opened the Conference with a brief speech of welcome and was elected to the presidium. He directed all the work of the Conference.

The Conference exposed and rejected the Right-wing capitulatory line of L. B. Kamenev, who gave a co-report on the present situation as the representative of an anti-Leninist group. L. B. Kamenev and A. I. Rykov tried to oppose the Leninist line towards the socialist revolution by the opportunist assessment of the 1917 revolution and the prospects of its development. Denying the possibility and need for the bourgeois-democratic revolution to develop into a socialist revolution, Kamenev proposed that the

Conference should confine itself to accepting control over the bourgeois Provisional Government on the part of the Menshevik-S.R. Soviets. The Conference rejected the capitulatory stand of Kamenev and his small group of supporters, who denied the possibility of the victory of socialism in Russia.

In his report on the revision of the Party Programme, Lenin determined the direction in which the Programme Committee set up by the Conference was to rewrite the Programme of 1903.

During the debate on the national question, G. L. Pyatakov spoke against Lenin's slogan of the right of nations to self-determination including secession and the formation of an independent state. In support of his resolution on the national question, Lenin said that this right alone ensured complete solidarity of workers and all working people of different nationalities, while the expediency of secession was to be decided by the proletarian party "in each particular case, having regard to the interests of social development as a whole and the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat for socialism" (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 302-03).

Lenin's thesis on the break with the Zimmerwald Centrist majority and the establishment of the Third, Communist International was opposed by G. Y. Zinoviev. The Conference made a mistake by voting for the Bolsheviks' participation in the Third Zimmerwald Conference, which was predominantly Centrist in composition, thereby delaying preparations for the establishment of the Third, Communist International. Life itself very soon corrected this mistake (see present edition, Vol. 24, p. 388, and the unfinished article "The Tasks of Our Party in the International", Vol. 26, pp. 220-22).

The Conference elected the Central Committee headed by Lenin.

The historic importance of the Seventh (April) Conference lay in the fact that it adopted Lenin's programme for transition to the second stage of the revolution in Russia, mapped out the struggle for the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution and put forward the demand for the transfer of all power to the Soviets. Under this slogan, the Bolsheviks prepared the masses for the proletarian revolution. p. 409

[537] The question of calling an international conference of socialists from the belligerent and neutral countries was repeatedly discussed by the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet in April 1917, the Executive Committee proposing to take the initiative in convening such a conference. In the second half of April, the Danish Social-Democrat Borgbjerg, who was connected with the social-chauvinists of Germany, came to Petrograd and on behalf of the United Committee of the Labour Parties of Denmark, Norway and Sweden (the social-patriotic majority of these parties) proposed that the socialist parties of Russia should take part in a peace conference to be called at Stockholm in May 1917.

On April 23 (May 6), Borgbjerg gave a report at a sitting of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, frankly declaring

that the German Government would agree to the peace terms the German Social-Democrats would put forward at the socialist conference. On April 25 (May 8), the Executive Committee heard statements by the Party groups on this question. The Bolsheviks read out the resolution of the April Conference adopted that day, "On Borgbjerg's Proposal"; they were joined by representatives of the Polish and the Latvian Social-Democrats. Lenin believed that participation in the proposed conference would be a complete betrayal of internationalism. The April Conference came out resolutely against participation, exposing Borgbjerg as an agent of German imperialism. The Trudoviks, Bundists and Mensheviks favoured participation. The Executive Committee adopted a Menshevik resolution declaring that it took upon itself the initiative in calling the conference and was setting up a special commission for the purpose. This decision was confirmed by the Plenary Meeting of the Soviet.

British, French and Belgian socialists of the majority refused to participate in the conference, for the British and the French governments wanted to defeat Germany. The Centrists agreed to take part: the group of J. Longuet from France, and the Independent Social-Democratic Party, with K. Kautsky, H. Haase and G. Ledebour at the head, from Germany.

The Spartacus group, which had affiliated to the party of "Independents" while retaining its organisational independence, refused to take part in the conference with the social-imperialists. Franz Mehring made a statement about this on his own behalf and on behalf of K. Liebknecht and R. Luxemburg who were in prison.

The conference did not take place because some of the delegates were not issued passports by their governments, and others refused to meet with representatives of the countries in a state of war with their own. p. 409

[538] *Rabochaya Gazeta* (Workers' Newspaper)—a Menshevik daily published in Petrograd from March 7 (20) to November 30 (December 13), 1917. From August 30 (September 12) it was an organ of the (United) R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee. The newspaper took a defencist stand and supported the bourgeois Provisional Government, fighting against Lenin and the Bolshevik Party. It gave a hostile reception to the October Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet power. p. 409

[539] *Yedinstvo* (Unity)—a newspaper published in Petrograd, the organ of the extreme Right group of Menshevik defencists led by G. V. Plekhanov. Four issues appeared in May and June 1914. From March to November 1917, It was published daily. Starting from December 1917 to January 1918, it appeared under the name of *Nashe Yedinstvo*. It gave support to the Provisional Government, favoured the coalition with the bourgeoisie and "firm power", and fought against the Bolsheviks, frequently resorting to the methods of the gutter press. Lenin noted that its line was "aiding and abetting the dark forces which threaten violence, bombs,

and riots" and called the paper an "abusive publication" (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 129, 199).

It gave a hostile reception to the October Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet power. p. 410

[540] This was written by Lenin for the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) (see Note 536). It became the basis for "Proposed Amendments to the Doctrinal, Political and Other Sections of the Programme" which was published in Lenin's pamphlet *Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme* (see present edition, Vol. 24, pp. 459-63). p. 418

[541] *Magistrates*—an administrative office introduced by the tsarist government during the Peasant Reform in 1861. They were appointed from the local gentry and were empowered to decide disputes between landowners and peasants arising from the Reform. They confirmed officials elected from among the peasants and the decisions of peasants' meetings; they also had powers to inflict punishment (arrest, fine) on peasants.

Stolypin, P. A.—Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister for the Interior in tsarist Russia from 1906 to 1911. His name is connected with a period of fierce political reaction. He issued a number of agrarian laws designed to create strong kulak farms in the countryside as a social bulwark for the tsarist autocracy. p. 425

[542] *The Agrarian Programme of the 104*—the agrarian bill signed by 104 members of the First Duma and tabled by the Trudoviks at the thirteenth sitting on May 23 (June 5), 1906. The bill said the aim of agrarian legislation was "to strive to establish an order under which all land with its minerals and waters would belong to the whole people, with the land required for agriculture being given for use only to those who would cultivate it by their labour" (*Gosudarstvennaya duma v Rossii v dokumentakh i materialakh* [The State Duma in Russia in Documents and Materials], Moscow, 1957, p. 172). The Trudoviks demanded the establishment of a "nation-wide land fund" which was to include all the state, crown, cabinet, monastery and church lands; there was also to be a forcible alienation into the fund of landed estates and other privately owned lands where the size of possessions was in excess of the labour norm established for the given area. Some compensation was to be paid for the alienated privately owned lands. Allotments and small privately owned tracts were to be retained by their owners for some time; the bill provided for a subsequent gradual transfer of these lands as well to the nation-wide fund. The agrarian reform was to be carried out by local committees elected by universal, direct and equal suffrage with secret ballot. p. 425

[543] This is an unfinished reply to the letter of the soldiers' committee of the 8th Horse Artillery Battery (army in the field) sent to the Petrograd Soviet. It was dated April 24 (May 7), 1917, that is, the period when the bourgeois and after it the petty-bourgeois press

started a slander campaign against Lenin and the other members of the Bolshevik Party who had returned to Russia from Switzerland via Germany.

The soldiers' letter said: "In view of the fact that there is much friction over Lenin among the soldiers of the battery, please let us have the earliest possible reply. What is his origin? Where had he been? If he had been exiled, what for? How did he return to Russia and what is he doing at present, that is, are his acts doing us good or harm? In short, we should like to be convinced by your letter, so as to stop our arguments, lose no more time and be able to prove our point to other comrades as well" (*Pravda* No. 86 of April 16, 1927).

The letter was passed on to Lenin. p. 430

[544] This is a short record of Lenin's report about the results of the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) at a city meeting of the Petrograd Party organisation held at the Naval Cadet Corps building and attended by 5,000-6,000 Party members. It was made by V. I. Nevsky and was to be published in the papers, but was not. The report was first published in 1927 in the first book of *Zapiski Instituta Lenina* (Transactions of the Lenin Institute). p. 431

[545] Krupskaya wrote the article in connection with the slander campaign started by the bourgeois and S.R. and Menshevik press against Lenin and other Bolsheviks who had returned to Russia via Germany. Lenin made the insertion as he was editing the article. It was published in *Soldatskaya Pravda* No. 21 on May 13 (26), 1917. p. 435

[546] *Vperyod* (Forward)—a mass workers' newspaper of the Bolshevik trend, directed by Lenin; it was published illegally in Vyborg by the Editorial Board of *Proletary* from September 10 (23), 1906, to January 19 (February 1), 1908. There were 20 issues.

It carried a number of articles by Lenin. p. 435

[547] A. V. Lunacharsky, who spoke before Lenin, proposed an ultimatum to the governments of France and Britain to make them accept the formula of peace without annexations and indemnities, and the announcing of a ceasefire on all fronts. At the same time, said Lunacharsky, we must appeal to the peoples of the Allied countries and also of Germany and Austria, urging them to exert pressure on their governments with all means at their disposal. If the German Government should insist on continuing the war under this unconditional formula, the falsity of its assertion that it was waging a defensive war would be exposed. p. 436

[548] *Volya Naroda* (People's Will)—a daily, the organ of the Right wing of the S.R. Party. It was published in Petrograd from April 29, 1917, and closed down in November 1917. Later it appeared under other names and was closed down for good in February 1918. p. 438

[549] *Novaya Zhizn* (New Life)—a daily published in Petrograd from April 18 (May 1), 1917, to July 1918. It was started by a group of Menshevik internationalists and writers connected with the journal *Letopis*. Characterising this group, Lenin said that "intellectual scepticism, which conceals and expresses lack of principle, is the dominant mood" in their midst (see present edition, Vol. 25, pp. 274-75), and ironically called them "would-be internationalists" and "pseudo-Marxists".

The newspaper took a hostile attitude to the Socialist Revolution in October 1917 and the establishment of the Soviet power. From June 1, 1918, it had two editions: one in Petrograd, another in Moscow. Both were closed down in July 1918. p. 439

[550] Lenin's report, which was central in the work of the All-Russia Conference of Front and Rear Military Organisations of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), has been preserved in two variants: as recorded by a correspondent of *Novaya Zhizn*, which published it the following day, June 21 (July 4), 1917, and by M. S. Kedrov (see his reminiscences "The All-Russia Conference of Military Organisations of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.)" in the book *Velikaya Oktyabrskaya Sotsialisticheskaya Revolutsia. Sbornik vospominany uchastnikov revolutsii v Petrograde i Moskve* [The Great October Socialist Revolution. A Collection of Reminiscences by Participants in the Revolution in Petrograd and Moscow], Moscow, 1957, pp. 77-79).

The All-Russia Conference of Front and Rear Military Organisations of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) was held in Petrograd from June 16 to 23 (June 29 to July 6), 1917. It was attended by 107 delegates from 43 front and 17 rear military Bolshevik organisations uniting almost 26,000 members of the Party. It was called by the Organising Bureau of the Central Committee Military Organisation. On its agenda were these questions: reports from the localities; attitude to the resolutions of the Seventh (April) Conference; the present situation; organisation of power and the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies; the war, the peace and the offensive; the agrarian question and others.

Lenin gave reports on the present situation and on the agrarian question. The conference recognised the need to replace the standing army by armed workers' battalions of the Red Guard placed at the disposal of the elected workers' organisations, and to replace the police by the people's militia (see *K.P.S.S. v rezolutsiyakh...*, Part I, pp. 354-67). The conference decided to regard the newspaper *Soldatskaya Pravda* as the Central Organ of the military organisations of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.), approved the draft Rules for the Military Organisation and elected the All-Russia Central Bureau of Military Organisations consisting of M. S. Kedrov, N. V. Krylenko, V. I. Nevsky, N. I. Podvoisky and others. The conference was of great importance in strengthening the ties between the proletariat and the soldier mass and helped to extend the work of the Bolsheviks among the soldiers. p. 439

[551] The theses were written by Lenin on July 10 (23), 1917, and defined the new tactical line of the Bolshevik Party in connection with

the changed political situation following the fusillade of the workers' and soldiers' demonstration on July 4 (17) and the transfer of all power into the hands of the counter-revolutionary Provisional Government. The theses were discussed at an Enlarged Conference of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) together with representatives of the St. Petersburg Committee, the Military Organisation of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) Central Committee, the Moscow Regional Bureau, the Moscow Committee and the Moscow District Committee, held on July 13 and 14 (26-27), 1917.

The theses were published in the form of an article under the title "Political Mood" on August 2 (July 20), 1917, in the newspaper *Proletarskoye Dyelo*. It was the organ of the Bolshevik group of the Kronstadt Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and was published in place of the Bolshevik newspaper *Golos Pravdy*, closed down in July by the Provisional Government. When the manuscript was being prepared for the press, the subtitle "Four Theses" and points 1, 2, 3, 4, the words "in the thesis" and also the end of the article (beginning with the words "Form illegal organisations...) were deleted; the words "armed uprising" were replaced by the words "resolute struggle".

The manuscript heading also contained the word "latest" in front of the words "Political Situation", which was also crossed out, but there is no certainty that it was done in connection with the publication of the document in the legal press since in that case the word "situation" would have been replaced by the word "mood". It should also be borne in mind that Lenin himself later mentioned in his "Aide memoire" (see Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*, Vol. 34, pp. 443-44) his theses on "the political situation" (and not "the latest political situation"). Finally, this document, since its first publication as belonging to Lenin (1925), has gone down in the Party history and is known to everyone precisely as "The Political Situation". Accordingly, the word "latest" has not been restored in Vol. 34 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*. p. 440

[552] Full power passed into the hands of the counter-revolutionary Provisional Government after the events of July 3-5, which were an expression of the most profound political crisis gripping the country. The failure of the Russian offensive at the front started by Kerensky on June 18 (31), the fresh sacrifices made for the benefit of the imperialists, the growth of unemployment in view of the closure of enterprises by the capitalists, the growing cost of living and the acute shortage of the foodstuffs caused an explosion of indignation among the broad masses of workers and soldiers over the counter-revolutionary policy of the Provisional Government. On July 3 (16) spontaneous demonstrations developed and threatened to grow into an armed uprising against the Provisional Government.

At the moment, the Bolshevik Party was against any armed action, for it believed that the revolutionary crisis had not yet matured, and that the army and the provinces were not yet ready

to support the uprising in the capital. A meeting of the Central Committee held on July 3 (16) together with the St. Petersburg Committee and the Military Organisation of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) Central Committee, decided to refrain from taking any action. A similar decision was also taken by the Second Petrograd City Conference of the Bolsheviks then in session. The delegates went to the districts to restrain the masses from taking action. But it had already begun and it proved impossible to stop it.

In view of the mood of the masses, the Central Committee, together with the St. Petersburg Committee and the Military Organisation, late at night on July 3 (16), decided to participate in the demonstration on July 4 (17) so as to lend it a peaceful and organised character. At the time, Lenin was away: he was ill due to overwork and had gone to the countryside for a few days' rest. When he was informed of the events, he returned to Petrograd on the morning of July 4 (17) and took over direction of the events.

More than 500,000 took part in the demonstration on July 4 (17). It was stared under Bolshevik slogans: "All power to the Soviets!" and others. The demonstrators nominated 90 representatives, who handed to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets a demand for the transfer of all the power to the Soviets. However, the S.R. and Menshevik leaders refused to take over.

With the knowledge and consent of the Menshevik-S.R. Central Executive Committee, the Provisional Government decided to suppress the demonstration by armed force. Military cadet and counter-revolutionary Cossack regiments were thrown against the peaceable demonstration of workers and soldiers. They opened fire on the demonstrators. Reactionary-minded military units were summoned from the front.

The conference of members of the C.C. and the St. Petersburg Committee, held under Lenin's direction on the night of July 4 (17), decided to stop the demonstration in an organised manner. This was a correct step taken by the Party, which succeeded in retreating at a right time and preserving the main forces of the revolution from being routed.

After the dispersal of the demonstration, the bourgeois Provisional Government continued its reprisals. It attacked the Bolshevik Party with special ferocity. The Bolshevik newspapers *Pravda*, *Soldatskaya Pravda* and others were closed down. Workers were disarmed, and arrests, searches and pogroms followed. The revolutionary units of the Petrograd garrison which had taken part in the demonstration were disbanded and sent to the front. The Mensheviks and S.R.s were accomplices of the counter-revolutionary butchers. p. 440

[553] The letter was written after the text of the leaflet, and judging by its content was intended for the Party Central Committee. The leaflet was not published. Lenin may have been the author of the leaflet. p. 443

[554] The theses were first published in full in Vol. 34 of the Fifth Russian edition of the *Collected Works*. The First edition of the

Collected Works (Vol. 14, Part II), and the Fourth edition of the *Collected Works* (Vol. 26), did not contain the section "On the List of Candidates for the Constituent Assembly" and the note to it. In Vol. 21 of the Second and Third editions of the *Collected Works* it was published in part.

The Third Petrograd City Conference was held from October 7 to 11 (20 to 24), 1917. It was attended by 92 delegates with vote and 40 delegates with voice only. Lenin was elected honorary chairman. Lenin's theses were the basis of the Conference decisions. In a resolution on the present situation, the Conference declared the need to replace the Kerensky government by a workers' and peasants' revolutionary government, for only such a government could give land to the peasants and take the country out of the war and the ruin. The Conference adopted resolutions "On the Red Guard" and "On the Hunger Strike by Political Prisoners in the Case of July 3 (16)-5 (18)". Its decisions emphasised that the country was on the eve of a massive proletarian uprising and expressed the firm conviction that the uprising would be victorious. The Conference discussed the question of elections to the Constituent Assembly, Lenin being among the first candidates nominated from Petrograd. The sitting on October 11 (24) heard Lenin's "Letter to the Petrograd City Conference" (see present edition, Vol. 26, pp. 145-48). The Conference played a very important part in the preparation of the Great October Socialist Revolution. p. 446

[555] The Provisional Government announced the convocation of the Constituent Assembly in its Declaration of March 2 (15), 1917. On June 14 (27), the Provisional Government adopted a decision appointing the elections to the Constituent Assembly on September 17 (30). But in August it postponed the elections until November 12 (25).

The elections were held after the victory of the October Socialist Revolution, on the appointed day. Polling took place by lists drawn up before the October Revolution and under the statute approved by the Provisional Government. A considerable section of the people had not yet had time to grasp the full significance of the socialist revolution, which was used by the Right-wing S.R.s, who managed to win majorities in gubernias and regions, far away from the capital and industrial centres. The Constituent Assembly was convened by the Soviet Government and opened in Petrograd on January 5 (18), 1918. The counter-revolutionary majority of the Constituent Assembly rejected the "Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People" which was placed before it by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, and refused to recognise the Soviet power. The bourgeois Constituent Assembly was dissolved by a decree of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee on January 6 (19). p. 446

[556] *Mezhraiontsi*—members of the Inter-District Organisation of the United Social-Democrats which arose in St. Petersburg in November 1913 with the idea of working for R.S.D.L.P. unity. Behind

the slogan of unity, and in an effort to merge the Bolshevik and the Menshevik organisations in St. Petersburg, the mezhraiontsi actually set up their own factional organisation, which included Trotskyite Mensheviks and also a section of former Bolsheviks who took a conciliatory attitude towards the opportunists.

During the First World War, the mezhraiontsi adopted a Centrist stand; they recognised the war as imperialist and opposed social-chauvinism, but did not agree to a full break-away from the Mensheviks. In 1917, the mezhraiontsi organisation, which included A. Joffe, A. Lunacharsky, D. Manuilsky, L. Trotsky, M. Uritsky, V. Volodarsky and I. Yurenev, announced its agreement with the Bolshevik Party line. At the Sixth Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) the mezhraiontsi organisation (almost 4,000 members) broke away from the Menshevik defencists and was admitted to the Bolshevik Party. Subsequent events showed that some mezhraiontsi (including Lunacharsky, Manuilsky, Volodarsky and Uritsky) did in fact break with their Centrist past and became prominent members of the Bolshevik Party. But Trotsky, even after he entered the Bolshevik Party, did not become a Bolshevik and carried on a secret and open struggle against Leninism and the Party's policy. He became the bitterest enemy of Leninism, the Soviet state and the entire international communist movement.

The mezhraiontsi published their own periodical—the journal *Vperyod* (one issue appeared in 1915 illegally). Its publication was resumed in 1917: from June to August it was published legally as the organ of the St. Petersburg Inter-District Committee of the United Social-Democrats (internationalists); there were 8 issues. After the Sixth Party Congress, the Editorial Board was changed and No. 9 appeared as an organ of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) Central Committee. In September its publication was discontinued under a Central Committee decision. p. 447

[557] *Dyelo Naroda* (The People's Cause)—a daily, the organ of the S.R. Party, published in Petrograd from March 1917 to July 1918, repeatedly under different names. It took a defencist and conciliatory stand, and supported the bourgeois Provisional Government. Its publication was resumed in Samara in October 1918 (four issues) and in Moscow in March 1919 (ten issues). The paper was closed down for its counter-revolutionary activity. p. 448

[558] A reference to the speeches of Y. M. Sverdlov, J. V. Stalin, F. E. Dzerzhinsky and G. Y. Sokolnikov at the Central Committee's sitting on October 20 (November 2), 1917, during the discussion of Lenin's letter to the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.) (see present edition, Vol. 26, pp. 191-94) in connection with the publication in the semi-Menshevik newspaper *Novaya Zhizn* of an item entitled "Y. Kamenev on the 'Uprising'", in which Kamenev, on behalf of Zinoviev and himself, opposed the armed uprising. See *Protokoly Tsentralnogo Komiteta R.S.D.R.P.(B.). Avgust 1917-fevral 1918* (Minutes of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.[B.]. August 1917-February 1918), 1958, pp. 106-08. p. 450

[559] The Cossack demonstration, or the Cossack "religious procession", in Petrograd was set for October 22 (November 4), 1917, and was regarded by the counter-revolutionaries as a show of force in their struggle against the mounting revolution. The Bolsheviks carried on extensive agitation among the Cossacks urging them to refrain from taking part in the demonstration. The Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies issued an appeal to the Cossacks. Representatives of the Cossack regiments were invited to a conference of regimental committees held by the Petrograd Soviet in Smolny on October 21 (November 3). At the conference, the Cossacks declared that they would not act against the workers and soldiers. The night before the demonstration, the Provisional Government was forced to call it off. p. 451

NAME INDEX

A

Adler, Victor—203, 207, 208, 248, 338, 361, 364
Adoratsky, V. V. (Arnatsky)—145, 150
Adrianov—238
Aizenstadt, I. L. (Yudin)—233, 234
Akimov (Makhnovets*), V. P.—93, 94
Alexander III (Romanov)—430
Alexander—*see* Shlyapnikov, A. G.
Alexeyev, N. A. (Andreyev)—146
Alexinsky, G. A.—261, 299, 334, 447
An—*see* Jordania, N. N.
Andreyev—*see* Alexeyev, N. A.
Arnatsky—*see* Adoratsky, V. V.
Asher—*see* Birnbaum, Nathan
Askew, John B.—359, 365
Asquith, Herbert Henry; 1st Earl of—289
Auhagen, Hubert—129, 130
Aurelle de Paladines, Louis Jean Baptiste d'—116, 121
Axelrod, P. B.—37, 39, 53-69, 192, 224, 365, 372, 373

B

Badayev, A. Y.—270
Balmashev, S. V.—69, 76
Baudrillart, Henry Joseph Léon—130
Bauer, Otto—314, 315, 316, 322, 386
Bebel, August—207, 208, 248, 339
Belsky—*see* Krasikov, P. A.
Ber—*see* Lieber, M. I.
Berg—*see* Martov, L.
Berger, Victor Louis—364
Bernstein, Eduard—340, 366
Bethmann-Hollweg, Theobald von—410
Birnbaum (Asher), Nathan—322
Bismarck, Otto Eduard Leopold, Prince von—117, 118, 120, 121, 390
Bissolati, Leonida—360, 362
Blanqui, Louis Auguste—116, 433
Bogdanov, A. A. (Malinovsky, A. A., Ivanov, Maximov)—149, 159, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 240, 435
Bonch-Bruyevich, V. D.—127, 128
Borchardt, Julian—353, 362
Boretsky—*see* Uritsky, M. S.
Borgbjerg, Frederik—409-11
Bosh, Yevgenia—368
Bourderon, Albert—359, 362, 377
Bracke, Wilhelm—115
Brandenburgsky, Y. N. (Yevgeny)—143
Branting, Karl Hjalmar—362, 396
Braun—*see* Janson, Y. E.
Brizon, Pierre—363
Bronski, M. G.—398
Bronstein, P. A. (Yuri)—233, 234, 239, 240
Buchenberger, Adolf—129, 130
Bukharin, N. I.—368, 386

* The names given in brackets in bold type are real names.

Bukvoyed—*see* Ryazanov, D. B.
Bulgakov, S. N.—130
Bunin, Y. A.—295
Buryanov, A. F.—270, 328

C

Cavaignac, Louis-Eugène—441
Chaliapin, F. I.—344
Cherevanin, N. (Lipkin, F. A.)—173, 174
Chernov, V. M.—62, 288, 439, 441, 448, 449
Chernyshevsky, N. G.—222
Chicherin, G. V. (Ornatsky)—359
Chkheidze, N. S.—270, 360, 372 373, 395, 397, 417, 418
Chkhenkeli, A. I.—270
Clemenceau, Georges Benjamin—209
Compère-Morel, Adéodat Constant Adolphe—340

D

Dąbrowski, Yaroslaw—117
Dan (Gurvich), F. I.—178, 180, 222, 224, 227, 235
Danielson, N. P. (N.— on)—38
Dansky, B. G. (Komarovsky, K. A., X)—292, 296
d'Aurelle de Paladines—*see* Aurelle de Paladines, Louis Jean Baptiste d'
David, Eduard—129, 130, 354
Debs, Eugene Victor—361, 364, 377
Denisov, V. P. (Vsevolod)—223
Desnitsky, V. A. (Sosnovsky)—146
Deutsch, L. G.—92, 93
Dietz, Johann Heinrich Wilhelm—35
Donald, James—289
Dubrovinsky, I. F. (Innokenty, Inok)—233, 234, 239, 240
Dupont, Eugène—121
Durnovo, P. N.—184
Dürr, Karl—392
Dzerzhinsky, F. E.—450

E

Engels, Frederick—56, 130, 221 340, 354, 382, 388, 389, 390, 395
Essen, A. M. (Kitayev, Stepanov)—139, 158-59, 160
Essen, E. E. (N. F.)—149
Ezra—*see* Rozen, M. M.

F

Favre, Jules—115, 119, 121
Ferry, Jules François Camille—115
Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas—222
Filatov, V. V. (V. S.)—150, 151
Findley, Noel—289
Firsov, K. K.—271
Fischer, Richard—339, 340, 341
Fortunatov, K. A.—320
Frank, Ludwig—343
Frankel, Leo—117
Fridolin, V. Y. (Varin)—368
Fritsch, Baron von—289

G

Galperin, L. Y. (Konyagin, Ru)—107
Gapon, G. A.—335
Gelman—417
Glebov—*see* Noskov, V. A.
Glenconner—289
Goldenberg, I. P. (Vishnevsky Meshkovsky)—227, 229, 230, 234
Goltz, Theodor Alexander von der—129, 130
Golubin—*see* Japaridze, P. A.
Goremykin, I. L.—35
Gorev, B. I. (Goldman, B. I., Igorev)—220
Gorky, Maxim (Peshkov, A. M.)—344-45
Gredeskul, N. A.—183, 184
Grigory—see Zinoviev, G. Y.
Grimm, Robert—368, 380, 391-92, 438
Guchkov, A. I.—404, 408, 440
Guesde, Jules—335, 339, 342, 373
Guilbeaux, Henri—398
Guiod, Alphonse-Simon—115

Gurevich, E. L. (Smirnov, Y.)—339, 343
Gvozdev, K. A.—360

H

Haase, Hugo—306, 340, 365, 371, 373
Haggard, Henry Rider—130
Hanecki (Fürstenberg), J. S.—256
Hapsburgs—263, 264
Hardie, James Keir—340, 341
Hartstein—*see* Levi, Paul
Hecht, Moriz—130
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich—222
Hertz, Friedrich Otto—71, 74
Hervé, Gustave—202, 340
Hilferding, Rudolf—384, 386, 388
Hillquit, Morris—360, 364, 365
Hoffmann, Arthur Hermann—438
Höglund, Carl Zeth Konstantin—362
Hubach, C.—130
Huschke, Leo—130
Huysmans, Camille—306, 365, 370, 379
Hyndman, Henry Mayers—340, 359, 363, 373

I

Ichas, M. M.—271
Igorev—*see* Gorov, B. I.
Ilyin—*see* Lenin, V. I.
Innokenty—*see* Dubrovinsky, I. F.
Inok—*see* Dubrovinsky, I. F.
Ionov (Koigen, F. M.)—238
Isuv, I. A. (Mikhail)—233, 234, 239, 240
Ivanov—*see* Bogdanov, A. A.

J

Jagiello, E. J.—270, 304, 305, 309
Janson (Braun), Y. E.—324, 325-26, 328
Jansson, Wilhelm—396
Japaridze, P. A. (Golubin)—170
Jaurès, Jean-Léon—335, 338
Jordania, N. N. (An. Kostrov)—90, 188, 233, 234, 238
Jouhaux, Léon—362
Junius—*see* Luxemburg, Rosa

K

Kablukov, N. A.—449
Kalinin, V.—*see* Karpinsky, V. A.
Kamenev, L. B. (Rosenfeld, L. B., Yuri)—143, 227, 241, 450-51
Kamsky—*see* Obukhov, V. M.
Karaulov, M. A.—271-72
Karpinsky, V. A. (Kalinin, V.)—177
Karsky—*see* Topuridze, D. A.
Kasso, L. A.—244
Katkov, M. N.—439
Kautsky, Karl—89, 90, 130, 175, 207, 232, 255, 314, 315, 316, 319, 321, 322, 339, 341, 342, 358, 364, 365, 371, 372, 373, 384, 386, 389, 393
Keir Hardie—*see* Hardie
Kerensky, A. F.—436, 440, 441
Khaustov, V. I.—270
Khomyakov, N. A.—225
Kitayev—*see* Essen, A. M.
Klawki, Karl—129, 130
Knunyants, B. M. (Rusov)—95
Kollontai, Alexandra—368
Konovalov, A. I.—283-85
Konovalov, I. A. (Nikolai)—179
Konyagin—*see* Galperin, L. Y.
Kostrov—*see* Jordania, N. N.
Kovalevsky, M. M.—295
Kozminykh-Lanin, I. M.—331-33
Kramolnikov, G. I.—158
Krasikov, P. A. (Belsky)—151, 155, 159
Krasin, L. B. (Zimin, Nikita)—148, 240
Krichevsky, B. N.—225
Krupskaya, N. K.—323, 435
Krushevan, P. A.—186
Krylenko, N. V.—447
Krymov, M. D.—407
Kuznetsov—*see* Litvinov, M. M.
Kvitkin, O. A. (Petrov)—159, 166

L

L. M.—*see* Martov, L.
L. V.—*see* Vladimirov, M. K.
Laffargue, François—289
Lange—*see* Stopani, A. M.
Larin, Y. (Lourie, M. A.)—179, 191-93, 243, 360, 446, 447
Lashevich, M. M.—407
Latyshev—*see* Litvinov, M. M.
Lecomte, Claude-Martin—117, 121
Lecouteux, Edouard—130
Ledebour, Georg—353
Leder, V. L.—339
Ledru-Rollin, Alexandre-Auguste—174
Leiteisen, G. D. (Vyazemsky, Lindov)—233, 234, 237
Lengnik, F. V. (Vasilyev)—107, 110
Lenin, V. I. (Ulyanov, V. I., Ilyin)—66, 69, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 124, 125, 126-27, 134-35, 139-41, 144, 145-46, 149, 150, 157, 158-59, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 181, 216, 219, 220, 222, 223-24, 225, 226, 247, 255, 256, 257, 324, 325, 327-28, 352, 368, 396, 397, 398, 399, 403, 404, 405, 406, 417-18, 427, 428, 430, 435, 436, 439, 450
Lensch, Paul—388, 389
Leonov—*see* Tskhakaya, M. G.
Lepeshinsky, P. N. (Olin)—127
Lepeshinsky, M. S. (Morozov)—143
Levi (Hartstein), Paul—398
Levin, Y. Y. (Yegorov)—92
Levinsky, V.—344
Lieber, M. I. (Goldman, M. I., Ber)—87, 88, 198, 238
Liebknecht, Karl—340, 348, 354, 356, 360, 361, 377, 383, 392, 437
Liebknecht, Wilhelm—288
Lindov—*see* Leiteisen, G. D.
Lissagaray, Prosper Olivier—117
Litvinov, M. M. (Kuznetsov, Latyshev)—158, 159
Lloyd George, David—362
Lomtatidze, V. B.—311-12
Longuet, Jean—358, 365, 372
Lopatin, G. A.—319
Louis Philippe—115
Lunacharsky, A. V. (Voinov)—148, 151, 163, 202, 224, 436
Luxemburg, Rosa (Junius)—225, 248, 255-60, 299, 387, 388, 390
Luzzatti, Luigi—338
Lyadov (Mandelstam), M. N.—88, 89, 127, 158, 220, 223, 225
Lyubich—*see* Sammer, I. A.
Lyubimov, A. I. (Mark)—143, 144

M

MacDonald, James Ramsay—340, 343
Maclean, John—403
Makar—*see* Nogin, V. P
Malecki, A. M.—256, 334
Malinovsky, R. V.—270, 277
Manuilov, A. A.—295
Marat—*see* Shantser, V. L
Mark—*see* Lyubimov, A. I.
Markov, N. Y. (Markov II)—249
Martov, L. (Tsederbaum, Y. O., Berg, L. M.)—39, 63, 74, 92-93, 95, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 122, 123-24, 174, 179, 188, 196, 222, 224, 225, 255, 256, 306, 327, 344, 360, 361, 365, 372, 380, 435
Martynov, A. (Pieker, A. S.)—55, 59, 60, 61, 65, 89, 93-94, 168, 220, 240
Marx, Karl—36, 56, 121, 130, 168, 174, 221, 319, 354, 382, 389, 414
Maslov, P. P.—339, 384
Maslov, S. L.—450
Maximov—*see* Bogdanov, A. A.
Mavrin, I. F.—407
Medem (Grinberg), V. D.—320, 323
Mehring, Franz—340, 341
Menshikov, M. O.—439
Merrheim, Alphonse—362
Mershchy, P. F.—271
Meshkovsky—*see* Goldenberg, I. P.
Mikha—*see* Tskhakaya, M. G.
Mikhail—*see* Isuv, I. A,

Mikhailov—*see* Postolovsky, D. S.
Mikhailov, N. N.—33-34
Mikhailovsky, N. K.—36-38
Milyukov, P. N.—284, 295, 408, 416
Molkenbuhr, Hermann—248
Morgari, Oddino—372, 391
Morozov—*see* Leshchinsky, M. S.
Morozov, T. S.—132
Mühlburg—289
Muranov, M. K.—277

N

N. F.—*see* Essen, E. E.
Napoleon III (Louis Bonaparte)—114, 115, 118, 119, 121
Natanson, M. A.—435
Nicholas II (Romanov)—264, 268, 431
Nikita—see Krasin, L. B.
Nikolai—see Konovalov, I. A.
Nobel, Alfred Bernhard—288
Nogin, V. P. (Maker)—233, 234, 237, 239, 412
N.—on—see Danielson, N. F.
North—289
Noskov, V. A. (Glebov, Yefimov)—93, 107, 125, 127, 142, 144

O

Obukhov, V. M. (Kamsky)—151
Olga—*see* Ravich, Sofia
Olin—*see* Lepeshinsky, P. N.
Ornatsky—*see* Chicherin, G. V.

P

Paladines—see Aurelle de Paladines, Louis Jean Baptiste d'
Pannekoek, Anton—315, 384, 385, 393
Parvus (Gelfand, A. L.)—145, 174
Patouillet, Joseph—388, 389
Pavlenkov, F. F.—324
Petrov—*see* Kvitkin, O. A.
Petrovsky, G. I.—270, 447
Petrunkevich, I. I.—174
Pernerstorfer, Engelbert—360, 364
Picard, Louis Joseph Ernest—115
Pisarev, D. I.—37
Platten, Friedrich (Fritz)—396, 397-98, 403
Plekhanov, G. V. (Valentinov)—39, 40, 42, 53-69, 104, 107, 109, 122, 123, 134-35, 188, 192, 202, 224, 225, 227, 247, 258, 261, 275, 287, 288, 299-300, 304, 309, 334, 335, 339, 353, 358, 364, 373, 409, 429
Pokrovsky, M. N.—447
Pokrovsky, V. I.—300-01
Poletayev, N. G.—227
Postolovsky, D. S. (Vadim, Mikhailov)—148, 168, 227
Potresov, A. N. (Starover)—96, 135, 224, 287, 288, 384, 385, 386, 395
Pressemane, Adrien—365, 372
Proudhon, Pierre Joseph—315
Purishkevich, V. M.—283, 284
Pyatakov, G. L.—368
Pyotr—*see* Ramishvili, N. V.

Q

Quelch, Harry—248

R

R. N. S.—*see* Struve, P. B.
Rabinovich—323
Radek, K. B.—255-60, 353, 368, 384, 385
Ramishvili, N. V. (Pyotr)—217, 219, 234, 239, 240
Rappoport, Charles—299
Rasputin (Novykh), G. Y.—335
Ravich, Sofia (Olga)—140
Remy, Léon—192
Renaudel, Pierre—373
Rocquigny, Robert—129, 130
Rodzyanko, M. V.—284
Roland-Holst, Henriette—358
Rolland, Romain—294
Roman—*see* Yermolayev, K. M.
Romanovs—263
Rozen, M. M. (Ezra)—216, 217
Rozhkov, N. A.—234, 242-43
Ru—*see* Galperin, L. Y.

Rubanovich, I. A.—208
Ruge, Arnold—382
Rühle, Otto—356, 359, 360, 362, 377
Rumyantsev, P. P. (Schmidt)—152, 162, 179
Rusanov, A. N.—270
Rusov—see Knunyants, B. M.
Russel, Charles Edward—360, 364
Ryazanov, D. B. (Goldendakh, D. B., Bukvoyed)—36, 364
Rybkin—166
Rykov, A. I. (Vlasov, Sergeyev)—155, 157, 229
Ryslev, A. I.—270

S

Safarov, G. I.—368
Sammer, I. A. (Lyubich)—234, 240
Samoilov, F. N.—270
Saumoneau, Louise—363
Sazonov, S. D.—265
Scheidemann, Philipp—410
Schmidt—see Rumyantsev, P. P.
Schneeberger, Friedrich Oskar—392
Sergeyev—see Rykov, A. I.
Serrati, Giacinto Menotti—354
Shagov, N. R.—270
Shanster, V. L. (Marat)—224, 225, 226, 229
Shingaryov, A. I.—405, 416, 425
Shlyapnikov, A. G. (Alexander)—368
Skobelev, M. I.—270, 437
Skvortsov, A. I.—67, 68
Smirnov, Y.—*see* Gurevich, E. I.
Sokolnikov, G. Y.—418, 450
Solovyov—426, 428
Sosnovsky—*see* Desnitsky, V. A.
Souchon, Augusto—130
Stalin (Jugashvili), J. V.—450
Stanislav—*see* Volsky, S. A.
Starover—*see* Potresov, A. N.
Stauning, Thorvald August Marinus—411-12
Steklov, Y. M.—227
Stepanov—*see* Essen, A. M.
Stolypin, P. A.—213, 238, 242
Stopani, A. M. (Lange)—89
Strakhov—see Takhtarev, K. M.
Ström, Frederik—396
Struve, P. B. (R. N. S.)—34, 36, 73, 96, 163, 313, 345, 388
Stumpfe, Emil—130
Sudakov, P. I.—266-67
Südekum, Albert—341, 373-74
Sukhanov, N. (Gimmer, N. N.)—368
Sun Yat-sen—281-83
Susane, Louis—115
Sverdlov, Y. M.—450

T

Takhtarev, K. M. (Strakhov)—86
Talalayev, V. T.—33
Taratuta, V. K. (Victor)—240
Tennant, Harold John—289
Thiers, Louis Adolphe—115, 116, 118, 121
Thomas, Albert—379
Thomas, Jacques-Léonard-Clément—117, 121
Tkachov, P. N.—37
Tomsky, M. P.—435
Topuridze, D. A. (Karsky)—89
Trepov, D. F.—182
Trevelyan, Charles Philips—342
Trèves, Claudio—362, 372, 373
Trier, Gerson—411
Trochu, Louis-Jules—115, 119, 121
Troelstra, Pieter Jelles—362
Trotsky (Bronstein), L. D.—242 247, 248, 328, 351, 358, 360, 403, 447
Tsereteli, I. G.—417, 418, 441
Tskhakaya, M. G. (Leonov, Mikha)—142, 224, 397
Tulyakov, I. N.—270
Turgenev, I. S.—256
Tyszka, Jan **(Jogiches, Léon)**—257

U

Ulyanov, A. I.—430
Ulyanov, V. I.—*see* Lenin, V. I.
Uritsky, M. S. (Boretsky)—360, 361

V

V. S.—*see* Filatov, V. V.
V. V.—*see* Vorontsov, V. P.
Vadim—*see* Postolovsky, D. S.
Vaillant, Edouard Marie—340, 362
Valentin, Louis-Ernest—116, 121
Valentinov—*see* Plekhanov, G. V.
Vandervelde, Emile—203, 339, 341, 342, 355, 373
Varin—*see* Fridolin, V. Y.
Vasilyev—*see* Lengnik, F. V.
Vedernikov, A. S.—417
Victor—*see* Taratuta, V. K.
Vinogradov, P. G.—295, 296
Vinoy, Joseph—116, 121
Vishnevsky—*see* Goldenberg, I. P.
Vladimirov, M. K. (Sheinfinkel, M. K., L. V.)—335
Vlasov—*see* Rykov, A. I.
Voinov—*see* Lunacharsky, A. V.
Vollmar, Georg Heinrich—203
Volsky, S. A. (Sokolov, A. V., Stanislav)—223, 439
Voronin, I. A.—33
Vorontsov, V. P. (V. V.)—36, 74
Vsevolod—*see* Denisov, V. P.
Vyazemsky—*see* Leiteisen, G. D.

W

Warski, Adolf **(Warszawski, A. S.)**—319
Wendel, Hermann—338, 339
Wijnkoop, David—358
Wilhelm I (Hohenzollern)—114, 121
Wilhelm II (Hohenzollern)—389, 403, 405, 410, 431
Williams, T. Russel—377
Winnig, August—359, 362
Wirth, Albrecht—389
Witte, S. Y.—35, 66, 67, 184
Wróblewski, Walery—117

X

X—see Dansky

Y

Yakovenko, V. I.—37
Yefimov—*see* Noskov, V. A.
Yegorov—*see* Levin, Y. Y.
Yermolayev, K. M. (Roman)—233, 234, 239, 240
Yevgeny—see Brandenburgsky, Y. N.
Yevseyev, I. T.—271
Yüan Shih-k'ai—281-82
Yudin—*see* Aizenstadt, I. L.
Yuri—*see* Bronstein, P. A.
Yuri—*see* Kamenev, L. B.
Yuzov (Kablits, I. I.)—37

Z

Zasulich, Vera—91
Zetkin, Clara—201-03, 354
Zhitlovsky, Kh. I.—71
Ziemelis, S.—329
Zimin—*see* Krasin, L. B.
Zinoviev (Radomyslsky), G. Y.—216, 397, 402-03, 40-6, 435, 450
Zurabov, A. G.—403

В. И. ЛЕНИН

СОЧИНЕНИЯ

Том 41

На английскот языке

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics